A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

By the same Author.

Sixth Edition, Crown 8vo, Price 7s. 6d.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

"Most carefully executed."
BISHOP ELLICOTT.

Third Edition, Crown 8vo, Price 10s. 6d.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

"His admirable Commentary."
DR. GODET in THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

Shortly, Crown 8vo.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, and to PHILEMON.

Fourth Edition, Crown 8vo, Price 1s.

HOLINESS, AS UNDERSTOOD BY THE AUTHORS OF THE BIBLE.

"It is among the books nearest to our mind on this much canvassed subject."
C. H. SPURGEON.

In a few days, Crown 8vo, Price 1s.

A TREATISE ON CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

LONDON: HODDER AND STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

Frederick F. Oakes.

A COMMENTARY

ON

ST. PAUL'S

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

BY

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

THIRD EDITION.

NEW YORK:
THOMAS WHITTAKER,
2 AND 3, BIBLE HOUSE.
1891.

PREFACE

THIS volume completes my exposition of the second and largest group of St. Paul's Epistles, viz. those of his Third Missionary Journey. Written as they were probably within the space of one year, these Epistles are closely related. And, fortunately, of St. Paul's movements during this year we have a partial narrative from the pen of one who at the close of the year was himself a travelling companion of the Apostle. The combined light shed by these four Epistles and by the Book of Acts makes St. Paul's inner and outer life better known to us during this year than at any other time. We are thus enabled to watch the activity, and even to read the secret springs of action, of the most conspicuous of the Apostles of Christ at the meridian of his course.

This historic light on St. Paul and his surroundings, supported as it is by the united testimony of the writers of the early Church, affords evidence which in all ages has assured all students, even those who have doubted the authorship of other Epistles attributed to him, that at least these four Epistles are from the pen of the Great Apostle. This certainty of authorship gives to these Epistles a special value, even amid the other Epistles bearing St. Paul's name and to those who confidently accept them all as genuine.

In harmony with this mutual relation of the Epistles, the three volumes in which I have annotated them form one complete work. I have endeavoured, by tracing the line of thought of these Epistles and by comparing them each with the others and with the Book of Acts, to reproduce the thought and

120033

the movements and surroundings of the Apostle of the Gentiles at the noonday of his career. This reproduction I hope to supplement by another volume expounding the profound Epistles written during the seclusion of his first long imprisonment, viz. those to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon: by a fifth volume comprising both his two earliest and his three latest extant Epistles, viz. those written during his second missionary tour, to the newly-founded Church at Thessalonica, and those written, as I hope to prove, after his release from his first imprisonment; and to conclude the series by a volume expounding St. Paul's teaching as a whole, comparing it with that of the other writers of the New Testament, and tracing the manifold teaching of these various writers to its one immediate source in the Gospel proclaimed by Christ and to its ultimate source in the Eternal Purpose of God.

This aim will explain some peculiarities of this volume, as of those preceding it. The theological scope of the whole work has led me to compare the teaching of Paul with that of John and James; and the apparent contradiction between Paul and this last writer compelled me to expound an important paragraph of the Epistle of James. I have also still further discussed in a separate Dissertation, as the chief matter of the Epistle to the Galatians, the great doctrine of Justification by Faith. As an aid towards reproducing the surroundings of St. Paul, I have added biographical notes on some other leaders of the early Church. These notes I was the more ready to insert because the historical surroundings of St. Paul are evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of the documents embodying or recording his teaching and movements. This value as evidence gives interest even to minute personal details.

The long note on the Sabbath is inserted partly because of the importance of the subject and the unsatisfactory treatment it seems to me to have hitherto received, and in part because I am deeply convinced that the true place of the Lord's Day in the New Covenant can be understood only in the light of the

great principles expounded in this Epistle, of which principles the Christian Day of Rest affords a valuable illustration.

To this note I wish to add that in my view the statement in Gen. ii. 3, taken in connection with the traces, casual and scanty though they are, of a septenary division of time earlier than the Exodus or away from Israel, points towards the institution of the Sabbath at the Creation. This seems to me to be the easiest explanation of all the facts of the case. But the evidence of a single statement in the Bible and that not a categorical assertion of the matter in question, and of a very few and somewhat indistinct references in pagan books or monuments, is not such as can be safely made a ground of confident argument in a matter so important as the Lord's Day. In my note I have endeavoured to show that the Christian Day of Rest bears on its front, in plain letters which every man can read for himself, the mark of its Divine origin and universal purpose. Reliance upon the scanty indications referred to above only obscures this more solid proof. On the other hand, this better proof, when once it is firmly established, receives confirmation even from these casual and scanty indications. For, if the Day of Rest was designed for all mankind, it is easy to believe that it was ordained at the Creation of the World.

It must, I fear, be admitted that the Epistle to the Galatians is not a general favourite. It is intensely doctrinal: and doctrinal theology is not only at first sight void of beauty but seems to belong rather to the college lecture hall than to practical life. Moreover, St. Paul's arguments are difficult to follow: and the matters he discusses pertain apparently to questions which have long ago passed away.

But Christian doctrines are uninteresting and void of beauty only when our view of them is distorted or partial. For they are an attempt to comprehend and to present the Eternal Thought and Purpose of God's Love to Man. And, just as this thought and purpose are the noblest conceivable outflow of the mind of God, so are they the noblest object of human

research and the most fascinating object of human contemplation. Eternal Truth cannot but be beautiful, when seen in its real proportions. The possible unattractiveness of its first partial appearance is but the painful effort of the finite eye of man to adapt itself to the brightness of Infinite Grandeur.

Similarly, the demonstrations of Newton's Principia may, when imperfectly understood or when taken singly, seem uninteresting. But, without these demonstrations, the profoundly interesting generalisation of Universal Gravitation could not have been reached and cannot now be fully appreciated.

Moreover, St. Paul's earnestness about the theological matters which in this Epistle he discusses, matters once agitating the Christian communities in Galatia and Antioch and Jerusalem, assures us of their immense importance to the spiritual life of the early Churches. And that which was vital then cannot but be important now. For the great questions of the Christian life belong to all ages. It is also very instructive to see, as in this Epistle, abstract doctrines assuming living form in actual Church life. And that the forms then assumed have passed away and have therefore no abiding interest, is an advantage: for it leaves our mind free to contemplate, without the prejudice evoked by the questions of our own day, broad underlying principles.

In this volume, as in the earlier ones, my chief aids in tracing the Apostle's thought have been a careful grammatical analysis of his words and sentences and a logical analysis of his argument.

The short comparison here given of St. Paul's conception of the Gospel and of Christ with that of other writers of the New Testament is an anticipation of a fuller comparison in my concluding volume. Such comparison is of immense value. For, the conception of the Gospel even by an Apostle was moulded and coloured by his mental and moral constitution and by his history and surroundings. This conception was

sufficient to enable him correctly and fully to preach Christ. But the imperfect reproduction which is all that we can now obtain of St. Paul's theology is not sufficient for us. We must endeavour to compensate in some measure for the imperfection of our reproduction of his conception by comparing it with what we can reproduce of the thought of other Sacred Writers. Thus, by combining various reflections in the minds of various men, we shall gain the best view possible to us of the great object at which they all reverently gazed.

I cannot forbear to point out the serious damage to theology from over-eagerness to assert and to press upon others the doctrines resulting from theological study, without first proving that they are involved in the teaching of Christ or of His Apostles. Excuse for this eagerness is found in the light and life derived from the doctrines advocated: for this light and life are, to the eager advocates, no small proof that the doctrines are true. But our own inward spiritual life cannot convince others. And, unless we show that our teaching is a necessary logical inference from the acknowledged teaching of the Apostles, our words are to others only a human dogma supported simply by our own fallible authority or that of the school of thought we represent. Such authority we have no right to expect any one to accept as decisive. The teacher who wishes to produce intelligent conviction should hide himself behind the frequent teaching of St. Paul or St. John; and show that in this teaching the Apostle quoted is supported by other writers of the New Testament. Doctrines supported by this combined authority, few will refuse to accept as genuine teaching of Christ. And this authority can be adduced for all the chief doctrines of Christianity. To aid theological research on these lines, is one aim of the present work, and accounts for some of its peculiarities.

A few words now about the relation of this method of research to the Dogmas of the Christian Church.

By Dogma I mean: formulated statement claiming to be accepted as true, not because of argument adduced, but

because of the authority asserting it. Or, apart from any claim to implicit acceptance, theological dogma may be understood to include all formulated statements embodying Christian teaching approved either by the early undivided Church or by any of the Churches of later days. It is a definite reflection, in the mind of the Universal Church or of some section of it, of the revelation of God in Christ, a reflection shaped and therefore in some measure distorted by the imperfection of the mirror. Of dogma thus understood, the creeds of the early Councils and the canons of the Council of Trent are good examples. To limit the word to this meaning, seems to me much better than to use it more loosely as synonymous with Systematic or Doctrinal Theology.

The dogmas, even of the early undivided Church, I am not prepared to accept as in themselves decisive, i.e. as infallible witnesses of the teaching of Christ. For I cannot find proof, in the promises of Christ or elsewhere, that such councils are incapable of error. At the same time, the judgment of the early Church is the testimony of a witness claiming highest respect. And, as matter of fact, it seems to me that the creeds of the early Councils agree in the main with the teaching of the Apostles.

Even the declarations about doctrine of later Churches are of great value as an expression of Christian opinion. Indeed, even statements we are compelled to reject are sometimes of no small use: for error becomes more evident when it assumes dogmatic form. Moreover, although the student will at first be puzzled by conflicting opinions of different Churches, he will soon rejoice to find underneath these differences a broad foundation of agreement about the central truths of Christianity. This agreement is a further confirmation that the teaching of the writers of the New Testament is from Christ, and is essential truth. As an aid to its discovery the dogmas of the Church and the Churches are of great value.

The general arrangement of the work is as before. The

text of the Epistle is broken up into Divisions and Sections: and, of these, the titles read consecutively form a shorter and a longer outline of the Epistle. Of the value of such divisions and titles as a means of tracing the writer's argument, I am day by day more deeply convinced. Indeed, to mark the turning points of thought and argument, is one of the most difficult and most important tasks of the expositor. These divisions also greatly aid frequent review of the path already trodden, an essential condition of sure progress along the Apostle's line of thought.

A comparison of the various divisions adopted by various commentators and by the Westminster Revisers reveals the extent to which the analysis of the Epistle is evident and indisputable. For, some divisions are accepted by all: others are variously placed. But even a division open to doubt is much better than none: for imperfect attempts often lead, sometimes by their manifest incorrectness, to discovery of the truth.

My translation of the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians has received from different critics criticisms most contradictory. Not a few of these criticisms have been occasioned by oversight of its aim. Nothing was further from my thought than to attempt a rendering suitable for general use. I have had no wish to rival the Revised Version. But it would have been worse than useless to reprint an existing translation: for, with a commentary, the student should use his own familiar copy of Holy Scripture. My translation was designed to supply, in some degree, the place occupied in critical commentaries by the Greek text. I have endeavoured to reproduce, more fully than their necessary limitations permitted the Revisers to do, at any sacrifice of elegance or even of English idiom, the sense and emphasis of the original. This I have tried to do sometimes by circumlocution, more frequently by a literal reproduction of the words and order actually written by St. Paul. The translation is printed, not at the top of each page, but at the beginning of each Section,

to suggest that before going on to the notes the student should read carefully the Apostle's own words.

Of commentaries on the Epistle, I have consulted all within my reach. The commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles mentioned in the preface to my volume on Romans have again been my companions; and with equal profit.

Luther's famous work has been constantly in my hands. I have read it with unflagging interest and great benefit. It is true that modern research has corrected not a few points in the Reformer's exegesis. And it is unfortunately true (see Diss. vi.) that occasionally his firm grasp of the great life-giving doctrine of Justification by Faith has obscured his view of other related doctrines, and has thus led him to incorrect or dangerous assertions. But in spite of the immense progress since his day in exact New Testament scholarship, and in spite of some blemishes, it is yet my deliberate judgment that, for the purpose for which the Epistle was written and for its chief practical worth now, Luther has caught and reproduced the inmost thought of St. Paul more richly than has any other writer, ancient or modern. The Reformer's disposition and history and surroundings placed him in sympathy with the Apostle to a degree which no mere scholarship can reach. His commentary on Galatians has therefore an interest which can never pass away.

Of modern German commentaries, after the invaluable work of Meyer, the thoughtful and thorough work of Wieseler has been of most use to me.

In this volume I have for the first time had the highly valued guidance of two writers whose names are already household words in English Biblical scholarship. I refer to the commentaries of Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot.

To the former of these writers my obligations, even in preparing my earlier volumes, are far beyond my power to express. The shape of his work was instructive. By issuing it in small volumes, each expounding only one short Epistle,

Dr. Ellicott did his readers the great service of confining their attention for the time to one short portion of Holy Scripture. And his example in analysing each word and inflexion of St. Paul's Epistles has exerted on my entire study of the Bible an influence which I can neither measure nor describe, and for which I am ever grateful. Each of his volumes, from end to end, I have carefully read. Dr. Ellicott's first volume, that on the Epistle to the Galatians, appeared a generation ago, when exact exposition of the New Testament was hardly known in this country. The immense progress since that day is in no small degree a result of the grammatical labours embodied in his commentaries.

Some decisions in Dr. Ellicott's early notes on Textual Criticism cannot now be defended; and only reveal the advance made since they were written. But these notes did much good by calling attention to the subject: and not unfrequently they anticipate judgments now universally accepted.

Equally valuable on the whole is Dr. Lightfoot's volume on the Epistle before us. Not quite so exact as Dr. Ellicott in his chosen province of grammar, Dr. Lightfoot is unequalled in a broader and more popular line which he has marked out for himself. He has given admirable English renderings of St. Paul's Greek words and phrases, and equally good paraphrases of entire paragraphs. Most valuable illustrations of St. Paul's language are brought from the whole round of Greek literature. Important various readings are carefully discussed. And matters of special interest bearing upon the Epistle are treated with great thoroughness and illustrated by a wealth of scholarship which is truly wonderful. The whole volume is a monument of sacred learning of which any nation or age might justly be proud. It has had my most careful and respectful study.

While accepting with thankfulness these great teachers, my work has been very much more than a popular reproduction of theirs. Even on their own ground I have at every point tested their work by independent research. Not one quota

tion has been taken from them without verification: not one decision of theirs has been accepted without careful sifting. Sometimes I have had to decide between their conflicting opinions. And very rarely (e.g. on ch. vi. 6) I have been compelled to dissent from their united judgment.

Moreover, the somewhat different aim of my commentary led me along a path which did not lie within the scope of either of these great expositors. Their chief aim was to trace, the one by exact grammatical analysis, the other by bringing to bear upon it light from all sources, the Apostle's line of thought in the Epistle annotated. To me St. Paul's line of thought was not so much itself an end as a means of reaching his general conception of the Gospel and of Christ. My aim is thus, in some sense, a stage in advance of theirs. Indeed, by selecting this as my special aim I have followed a suggestion of Dr. Ellicott in the preface to his volume on Galatians that each commentator confine himself to a special province of exposition. But inasmuch as I could not reach my further department without passing through theirs, I have trodden again the ground on which they had previously laboured, using with thankfulness the path which their footsteps have made. It seemed to me that beyond their field of labour lay another field most fruitful in spiritual good, and that I should best advance the real ultimate aim of their work by pressing forward, along the solid way they have formed, to the richer land beyond.

A still further province of theological research is reached by combining the already reproduced conceptions of the Gospel by individual Apostles in order thus to gain a view, infinitely imperfect as it must ever be, of the one Eternal Reality underlying these individual conceptions.

The spiritual and practical nature of the aim noted above has enabled me to put the results of my study into a form accessible, not only to students of the Greek Testament for whom alone Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot have written, but to all intelligent readers of the English Bible. I have thus

been able to hold out a light to many earnest followers of Christ who cannot use the great works just referred to.

Of popular commentaries on the Epistle to the Galatians, the best I have seen is that by Dean Howson in *The Speaker's Commentary*, which is good from beginning to end and has often been of use to me. But the limits of the large work of which it is a part do not allow him nearly so much space for exposition as I have occupied: and the general scope of the whole work does not include the distinctive theological features so conspicuous in my volumes.

And now my work with all its many imperfections must go forth to the world. For more than two years it has been my constant companion. Throughout that period the letter of the Great Apostle to his wayward disciples in Galatia has borne in my own spiritual life abundant fruit. And, whatever may become of the book I have written, I am sure that a careful study of this Epistle and of the great doctrines therein so carefully and earnestly expounded will produce in all sincere and loving students results far above their highest expectations.

EPWORTH LODGE, WREXHAM, N. WALES,
26th January, 1885.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

SINCE the publication of the first edition, *The Hibbert Lectures* on *The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity* have been delivered in London and Oxford by Dr. Pfleiderer of Berlin; and have been published in one volume. These lectures embody, in popular form and with popular application, the chief results of a much larger work by the same author, entitled *Paulinism: a contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology*. And this earlier work helps us to understand the more popular volume just issued.

The larger work is a careful, scholarly, accurate, and honest reproduction of St. Paul's conception of the Gospel and of Christ. Its honesty is the more remarkable and the more praiseworthy because the writer intimates that he does not share

the belief about Christ held firmly by the Apostle as the foundation of the Gospel he preached so successfully. On page 161 of the *Lectures*, Dr. Pfleiderer asks, "Would such a view of Christ be conceivable in the case of a man who had lived in personal intercourse with Jesus?" and suggests here and there in both works that Christ was not in reality what He was in the thought of St. Paul.

The writer recognises cordially the unique and everywhere conspicuous position in the theology of St. Paul occupied by the Death of Christ as the means of man's salvation and as a sacrifice for man's sin, by Faith as the one condition of salvation, and by the Resurrection of Christ as the ground of faith in Christ. He also attributes to the Gospel preached by St. Paul the establishment of Christianity as a world-wide religion. On the other hand, he acknowledges that the Apostle derived the inspiration of his life-work from one whom he felt to be infinitely greater than himself; and asserts, on p. 10 of the *Lectures*, "that the work of Paul presupposes as its indispensable basis the personal history of Jesus, without which it would be as a castle in the clouds." Dr. Pfleiderer thus opposes both those who make St. Paul the real founder of Christianity, and those who charge him with perverting the teaching of Jesus.

The lecturer attributes confidently to the Apostle the four Epistles I have annotated, and that to the Philippians; the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Timothy, and Titus, to later writers of the same school. He also supposes that the Second, Third, and Fourth Gospels, the Book of Acts, 1 Peter, and the Apocalypse were written under the influence of St. Paul's teaching; all of these, except perhaps the Second Gospel, dating from sub-apostolic times. This supposition implies essential harmony underlying the conspicuous dissimilarity of these very different documents; a harmony which, in a fragmentary manner, I have endeavoured to point out.

As an exponent of the teaching of St. Paul and of its harmony, in whole or in part, with nearly all the writings of the New Testament, I may claim Dr. Pfleiderer as confirming the findings of my own volumes. And on the basis of this agreement must be discussed the historical and theological truth of the teaching put forth with results so wonderful by the greatest of the Apostles of Christ.

WREXHAM, *9th July*, 1885.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION—

Sec. i. IS THE EPISTLE GENUINE?
,, ii. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE OUR COPIES AND VERSIONS CORRECT?
,, iii. THE GALATIANS AND THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

EXPOSITION—

Sec. 1. Ch. I. 1—5. Apostolic Greeting to the Galatian Christians.
,, 2. Ch. I. 6—10. Their early Apostacy.

DIV. I. PAUL'S CONTRARY CONDUCT AND PRINCIPLES.
CHS. I. 11—II.

Sec. 3. Ch. I. 11, 12. Paul's Gospel is divine.
,, 4. Ch. I. 13, 14. His former life.
,, 5. Ch. I. 15—17. His conversion and journey to Arabia.
,, 6. Ch. I. 18—24. His visit to, and early departure from, Jerusalem
,, 7. Ch. II. 1—10. A subsequent visit to Jerusalem.
,, 8. Ch. II. 11—23. Paul's resistance to Peter, and exposition of his own principles. [THE LORD'S BROTHERS.]
[JAMES.] [PETER.] [JOHN.] [BARNABAS.]

DIV. II. JUSTIFICATION IS BY FAITH, APART FROM LAW AND THEREFORE FROM CIRCUMCISION.
CHS. III.—V. 13*a*.

Sec. 9. Ch. III. 1—5. By faith the Galatian Christians received the Spirit.
,, 10. Ch. III. 6—9. Just so, by faith Abraham was justified.
,, 11. Ch. III. 10—14. For, the Law brings only a curse.

Sec. 12. Ch. III. 15—18. Yet the Law cannot set aside the still earlie promise.
,, 13. Ch. III. 19—24. The Law was designed to lead us to faith in Christ.
,, 14. Ch. III. 25—29. By faith we are, in Christ, heirs of Abraham.
,, 15. Ch. IV. 1—7. Pupilage is past: and we have received the Spirit of Adoption.
,, 16. Ch. IV. 8—11. Then turn not back to things left behind. [THE SABBATH.]
,, 17. Ch. IV. 12—20. Personal appeal to the Galatians.
,, 18. Ch. IV. 21—V. 1. The Covenants of Bondage and of Freedom.
,, 19. Ch. V. 2—13*a*. To receive Circumcision is to reject Christ.

DIV. III. CHRISTIAN MORALS. CHS. V. 13*b*—VI. 10.

Sec. 20. Ch. V. 13*b*—15. Love to our neighbour is the sum of the Law.
,, 21. Ch. V. 16—26. The Spirit and the Flesh.
,, 22. Ch. VI. 1—10. Special Applications.

CONCLUSION OF THE EPISTLE. CH. VI. 11—18.

Sec. 23. Ch. VI. 11—16. The Adversaries are insincere.
,, 24. Ch. VI. 17, 18. Farewell.
[THE DISTURBERS IN GALATIA.] [REVIEW OF THE EPISTLE.]

DISSERTATIONS—

Diss. i. THE BOOK OF ACTS COMPARED WITH THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.
,, ii. THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS AND TO THE ROMANS COMPARED WITH THAT TO THE GALATIANS.
iii. THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.
iv. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES COMPARED WITH THAT TO THE GALATIANS.
,, v. THE GOSPEL AND FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN COMPARED WITH THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.
,, vi. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.
,, vii. THE CROSS OF CHRIST.
,, viii. SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

ANCIENT AUTHORS QUOTED.

*An asterisk * denotes the name of a pagan writer; an obelisk † denotes a Jew. All others are Christians.*

*Alexander of Aphrodisias, in Caria, about A.D. 200: Greek commentaries on Aristotle.

*Aristotle, Athens and Macedonia, B.C. 384—322, tutor of Alexander the Great: *Nicomachean Ethics*, a truly great work, and many other works, in Greek.

Athanasius, A.D. 296—373, Archbishop of Alexandria, his native city. Various works in Greek.

Augustine, A.D. 354—430, Bishop of Hippo, North Africa: many Latin works.

Barnabas: name given to an anonymous epistle written probably early in the second century; see p. 71.

*Cæsar, Caius Julius: the Roman Dictator, B.C. 100—44. His *Commentaries* tell in part the story of the Gallic and Civil Wars.

Chrysostom, Antioch and Constantinople, A.D. 347—407: voluminous commentaries on Holy Scripture, chiefly in the form of homilies, and other works.

Clement of Alexandria, about A.D. 155—220; wrote *Exhortation to the Greeks*, *Stromata* or *Patchworks*, and *Pædagogue*.

Clement of Rome: see my *Corinthians*, p. 516.

Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria from A.D. 412—444: various theological works in Greek.

*Dion Cassius, born in A.D. 155, at Nicæa in Bithynia: a Roman statesman. He wrote in Greek a valuable *Roman History*.

Ephrem: A.D. 300—378 about: born in Mesopotamia. He wrote various works in Syriac; commentaries, sermons, hymns, etc.

*Eratosthenes, lived at Cyrene, Athens, Alexandria, B.C. 276—196 about. He wrote on geography, astronomy, etc.; of which only fragments remain.

Eusebius, A.D. 264—339 about, Bishop of Cæsarea; wrote *Church History*, *Preparation for the Gospel*, and other works.

Hegesippus: a Christian writer of the second century, whose works are lost but are quoted in Eusebius' *Church History*.

Helvidius, lived in Rome during the fourth century. He was considered a heretic.

Hermas, author of a Greek work called *The Shepherd*, written probably in the middle of the second century.

*Herodotus, Asiatic Greek, B.C. 484—406 about. He wrote a great historical work, the earliest extant.

Hippolytus, a Greek writer, who lived probably early in the third century.

Irenæus, about A.D. 140—200: Bishop of Lyons. See my *Romans* p. 5.

Jerome, about A.D. 340—420: Latin commentaries, Vulgate version, etc.

†Josephus, Jewish historian, A.D. 37—100 about. He wrote *Antiquities of the Jews*, *Wars*, etc.

Justin, about A.D. 100—170, wrote in Greek *First* and *Second Apologies*, and *Dialogue with Trypho*.

*Livy, Roman historian, B.C. 59—A.D. 17.

Origen, Egypt and Syria, A.D. 186—253. He wrote, in Greek, commentaries, etc.

Pamphilus, of Cæsarea, martyred in A.D. 309, joint author with Eusebius of an *Apology for Origen*.

*Pausanias, Asiatic Greek, second century A.D., wrote a description of Greece.

†Philo, Egyptian Jew, died about A.D. 50: many Greek works, chiefly expounding the Old Testament.

*Plato. Athenian philosopher, B.C. 430—347: voluminous works in the form of Dialogues.

*Plutarch, lived in Greece A.D. 50—120 about. He wrote *Compared Lives* and *Morals*.

*Polybius, about B.C. 204—122, born in Greece: he wrote, in Greek, a history of the Punic Wars, etc.

Rufinus, lived in Italy and Palestine A.D. 345—410; wrote translations of some works of Origen, etc.

*Strabo, Asia Minor and Rome, about —A.D. 24: an important work on Geography.

*Tacitus, about A.D. 60—118, Roman historian; wrote *Annals*, *Histories*, etc.

Tertullian, Carthage, about A.D. 160—240: many Latin works.

*Varro, B.C. 116—28, a Roman scholar: various works.

Peshito Version: a translation of the Bible into the language of Syria and Mesopotamia, made not later than the fourth century.

Samaritan Pentateuch: a recension of the Hebrew text preserved among the Samaritans.

Vulgate Version: a translation of the Bible into Latin, made by Jerome after earlier versions had become common. It was authoritatively edited by order of Pope Sixtus VI., and later by Clement VIII.

OTHER SCRIPTURES ILLUSTRATED.

		PAGE
Gen.	ii. 3	115
,,	viii. 10	115
,,	xii. 3	79
,,	xiii. 15	86
,,	xv. 6	78, 206
,,	xvii. 8, 19	86
,,	xvii. 10, 11	141
,,	xxi. 9	137
,,	xxii. 16—18	87, 206
,,	xxix. 27	115
Exod.	iii. 2	93
,,	vi. 16—20	90
,,	xii. 40, 41	89
,,	xvi. 22, 29	115
,,	xx. 8	115
,,	xxxi. 12—17	114
Lev.	xii. 3	142
,,	xviii. 5	82
,,	xix. 18	152
Deut.	xxi. 23	83
,,	xxvii. 26	81, 95
,,	xxxi. 26	81
,,	xxxiii. 2	93
Joshua	i. 8	81
,,	ii. 11	207
,,	v. 5	142
2 Kings	xxii. 8, 11	81
Job	ix. 33	94
Psalm	lxviii. 17	93
,,	cxliii. 2	51
Isaiah	liv. 1	135
Jer.	i. 5	105
Ezek.	xx. 12	115
,,	xxxvi. 27	84
Dan.	x. 13. xii. 1	93
Joel	ii. 28 (iii. 1)	84
Hab.	ii. 4	82
Zech.	viii. 13	83
Matt.	v. 3	125
,,	vi. 2	47
,,	x. 3	60
,,	x. 4	26
,,	xii. 37	205
,,	xii. 47	59
,,	xiii. 55	60
,,	xx. 8	102
,,	xxiii. 37	134
,,	xxvii. 56	60
Mark	iii. 18	26
,,	iii. 31	59
,,	vi. 3	60
,,	vi. 4	62
,,	vii. 15ff	145
,,	xii. 10	79
,,	xv. 40	60
Luke	ii. 7	59
,,	iv. 21	79
,,	iv. 26	49
,,	viii. 3	102
,,	viii. 19	59
,,	xviii. 14	207

		PAGE
Luke	xxiv. 49	84
John	i. 6	105
,,	i. 12	211, 213
,,	ii. 12	59
,,	v. 22, 24	211
,,	vi. 29	211
,,	vi. 56	213
,,	vii. 5	61
,,	vii. 38f	212
,,	viii. 39ff	212
,,	xiv. 16, 26	213
,,	xv. 4	213
,,	xix. 25	60
,,	xix. 37	79
Acts	i. 4	84
,,	i. 14	59
,,	iii. 25	132
,,	vii. 30	93
,,	vii. 53	92
,,	ix. 19	28
,,	ix. 23—26	186
,,	ix. 27	30, 187
,,	ix. 31	15
,,	x. 20	33
,,	xi. 30	188
,,	xii. 1	188
,,	xii. 17	63
,,	xiii. 38f	193
,,	xv. 2—5	33, 189
,,	xvii. 31	14
,,	xviii. 22	190
,,	xx. 26	142
,,	xxi. 18ff	63
,,	xxiv. 15	144
,,	xxvi. 20	188
Acts	xxvi. 22	142
Rom.	xiii. 12	25
,,	xiv. 5	121
,,	xiv. 14	50
2 Cor.	xi. 4	19
Eph.	iv. 17	142
Phil.	i. 21	55
,,	ii. 20	144
,,	iv. 7	96
Col.	i. 5	144
,,	ii. 8, 20	103
,,	ii. 16	114
1 Thess.	ii. 12	142
,,	ii. 16	164
,,	iii. 5	35
1 Tim.	ii. 5	14
2 Tim.	iii. 16	79
Philem.	19, 21	172
Heb.	ix. 28	144
,,	x. 36	84
,,	xi. 10	135
,,	xii. 22	135
,,	xiii. 14	135
James	i. 3	203
,,	ii. 5, 8	209
,,	ii. 14—26	204
,,	ii. 23	209
1 Peter	i. 5	96
1 John	ii. 12	212
,,	iii. 1, 2	212
,,	iii. 9, 10	212
,,	iii. 20	45
,,	v. 1, 2	212
Rev.	i. 10	118
,,	xxi. 2	135

Additional Note on Gal. iii. 20—22

Wherever there is a mediator, two parties are concerned. Consequently, there *is no mediator of one person*: contrast 1 Tim. ii. 5, 'mediator of God and men.' This reminds us that the Law given by the mediation of Moses (see under *v.* 19) was a contract in which not only *God*, who *is one Person*, graciously bound Himself to bestow certain blessings, but also Israel bound itself to obey the whole Law then given. It thus differed absolutely from the promise given in Gen. xxii. 16—18 to Abraham, which bound only one person, viz. God. [Contrast *God is one Person* with Jno. x. 30, 'I and the Father are One thing.']

Now it might be thought that this mutual engagement, which Israel could never fulfil, would invalidate the earlier promise to Abraham. If so, the Law given at Sinai and formally accepted by Israel would be *against the promises of God*, i.e. it would be something designed to prevent their fulfilment. This Paul disowns: *far from it.* Indeed he has already, in *vv.* 16, 17, disproved it. But he here introduces the objection again in order further to support his denial by stating the divine purpose of the obligation and bondage which Israel assumed through the mediation of Moses, viz. that this bondage (*v.* 22) might force men to faith in Christ in order thus to obtain the fulfilment of the ancient promises. Thus the word *mediator* at the end of *v.* 19, as expounded in *v.* 20, suggests the objection stated in *v.* 21*a*: and this objection is overturned by the statement in *v.* 22 of the real purpose of the obligation laid upon Israel by the Covenant of Sinai.

TO THE READER.

v. 10*a*, *v.* 10*b*, denote the former, and latter, parts of verse 10.
v. 10f, *v.* 10ff, „ verses 10, 11; and verses 10, 11, 12, etc.
O.T. and N.T. „ the Old and New Testaments.
AV. and RV. „ the Authorised, and Revised, English Versions.
LXX. denotes the Septuagint Greek Translation of the Old Testament. See my *Romans* page xx.
Put-to-shame represents one Greek word.
[Square brackets] enclose references to the Greek Text.
In the Exposition *italic type* is used only for my literal translation of the words of the verse under exposition; and, in the Dissertations, for quotations from the Epistle to the Galatians, and in Diss. iv. for those from Jas. ii. 14—26 which is there expounded. Other quotations from Scripture, and paraphrases, are enclosed in 'single commas.'

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

SECTION I.

IS THE EPISTLE GENUINE?

1. The external evidence quoted in proof that the Epistle to the Romans was written by Paul is equally valid for that to the Galatians.

2. This Epistle, like those to the Romans and Corinthians, is found in all Greek manuscripts of Paul's Epistles; and in the Latin, Syriac, Egyptian, Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions.

3. The Epistle was accepted by the entire early Church, without a shadow of doubt, as a genuine work of Paul.

JEROME, in the Preface to his commentary on the Epistle, a work still extant, says that ORIGEN "wrote five volumes on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians." Unfortunately, of this earliest commentary there remain only three fragments preserved in a surviving Latin translation of bk. i. of the *Apology for Origen* by Pamphilus. But in his extant works Origen frequently quotes this Epistle (e.g. on Rom. iii. 27, 29) as written to the Galatians by Paul the Apostle.

TERTULLIAN (*Against Marcion* bk. v. 2—4) names the Epistle expressly as written to the Galatians by Paul the Apostle, and gives a full outline of it, with many quotations. He reasons with Marcion from it, as being accepted by him as genuine, whereas some other parts of the New Testament he rejected. This long argument proves that the Epistle was accepted, not only by

Tertullian at the close of the second century, but in the middle of the century even by a famous enemy of the Gospel.

CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA quotes the Epistle to the Galatians less frequently even in proportion to its length than those to the Romans and Corinthians. This is explained by the fact that it refers almost exclusively to a Jewish error with which Clement had little to do. His quotations are for the more part passages bearing upon general Christian life. They are, however, abundantly sufficient to prove beyond possibility of doubt that Clement accepted the Epistle with perfect confidence as a work of Paul. Not unfrequently he quotes it anonymously. Sometimes he attributes it to "the Apostle": e.g. *Pædagogue* bk. i. 6, where he quotes in full Gal. iii. 23—28 and iv. 1—5, 7. The context shows that "the Apostle" is Paul. So ch. 11: "Paul says that there was given 'a tutor for Christ.'" Cp. *Stromata* (or *Miscellanies*) bk. iii. 15: "For which cause Paul writing to the Galatians says, 'My little children, for whom again I suffer birth-pangs until Christ be formed in you.'"

IRENÆUS frequently quotes this Epistle by name as a work of the Apostle Paul. So *Against Heresies* bk. iii. 13. 3: "That Paul went up with Barnabas to Jerusalem to the Apostles, not without reason but in order that by them the liberty of the Gentiles should be confirmed, himself says in the Epistle to the Galatians: 'Then after fourteen years I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking also Titus. But I went up according to revelation: and I set before them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles.' And again he says, 'For an hour we yielded by subjection that the truth of the Gospel may remain with you.'" There are similar quotations in chs. 6. 5, 7. 2, 16. 7, 22. 1; a long quotation in bk. v. 11. 1, and others in chs. 21. 1, 32. 2. In bk. i. 3. 5, Irenæus quotes Gal. vi. 14 as attributed to Paul by the VALENTINIANS, followers of a heretic contemporary with Marcion. Unfortunately, the above quotations are found only in a Latin translation, which is all that remains to us of a great part of the work of Irenæus. And early translations are always uncertain. Of error from this source the quotation above of Gal. ii. 5 is an example. See notes.

From Hippolytus, *Heresies* bk. v. 2, we infer that the Epistle was also known and used by the OPHITES, a still earlier sect.

The FRAGMENT of MURATORI says: "First of all to the Corinthians forbidding division of sect; then to the Galatians forbidding circumcision."

Several passages in writings still earlier than the above, suggest that the authors had seen the Epistle to the Galatians.

These quotations prove clearly that towards the close of the second century the Epistle was everywhere accepted with perfect confidence as a genuine work of the Apostle Paul. And the references to Heretics afford a strong presumption that it was accepted, alike by friends and foes, in the middle of the century.

4. This external evidence is strongly confirmed by the contents of the Epistle. For, it is in the last degree unlikely that any one, hoping to gain credence for a forgery, would fill it with severe censure of entire Churches mentioned by name; a censure hardly mitigated by a word of approval, and thus standing apart from all other extant rebukes by Paul. Moreover, although for this Epistle to the obscure Churches of Galatia we have not all the circumstantial evidence and incidental references to matters of fact fixing time and place of writing found in the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, yet we shall find in Diss. ii. abundant proof that all four Epistles are from the same pen. Consequently, the evidence that the other three Epistles were written by Paul is valid for the Epistle now before us. And several historical coincidences with the Book of Acts will, in Diss. i., afford special confirmation of its genuineness.

SECTION II.

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE OUR COPIES AND VERSIONS CORRECT?

1. Of the changes adopted without note by the Revisers in their Greek text of the Epistle to the Galatians, the following are also adopted without note by all recent Critical Editors, viz. by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort.

1. Ch. i. 10: omit 2nd *for*.
2. ,, ,, 18, ii. 11, 14: *Cephas* for *Peter*.
3. ,, ii. 14: *how* for *why*.
4. ,, ,, 16: insert *yet*, or *but*, before *knowing*.
5. ,, iii. 1: omit *that you should not obey the truth*.
6. ,, ,, ,: ,, *among you*.
7. ,, ,, 17: ,, *in Christ*.
8. ,, ,, 23: see notes.
9. ,, ,, 29: omit *and* before *heirs*.

10. Ch. iv, 6: *our* for *your*.
11. ,, ,, 7: *through God* for *of God through Christ*.
12. ,, ,, 14: *temptation to you* for *my temptation*.
13. ,, ,, 24: omit *the*, before *two covenants*.
14. ,, ,, 25: *for she* instead of 2nd *and*.
15. ,, v. 1: rearrangement of the verse.
16. ,, ,, 14: *has been fulfilled*, for *is fulfilled*. See notes.
17. ,, ,, 17: *for these are*, instead of *and these are*.
18. ,, ,, 19: omit *adultery*.
19. ,, vi. 15: *is* for *avails*.
20. ,, ,, 17: omit *the Lord*.

Every one of these corrections is supported by a clear preponderance of ancient documents: Nns. 1—3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 18, 19, by evidence so abundant and varied as to exclude doubt. And some of them, especially Nos. 6, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, are of considerable importance.

2. The only changes affecting appreciably an English translation which the Revisers adopt without note and about which the critical texts differ are:—

1. Ch. i. 11: *for* instead of *but*.
2. ,, iv. 26: omit *all*.
3. ,, v. 21: ,, *murderers*.
4. ,, vi. 15: ,, *in Christ Jesus*.

In No. 2, the Revisers' reading is supported by a clear preponderance of the oldest and best MSS. and versions. It is accepted without note by all Editors since Lachmann who gave it a place in his margin; and is practically beyond doubt. Very interesting is No. 4. The displaced reading is found in all uncials except the Vatican MS. and in nearly all cursives, and in both Latin versions and the Coptic version; but looks so much like a reminiscence of ch. v. 6 that with the Syriac and some other versions and with Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine we may somewhat confidently reject it. Similar insertions are very common; e.g. ch. iii. 1 from v. 7. The shorter reading, which the Revisers adopt, is given by Tischendorf, in the text of Tregelles, and without note by Westcott and Hort. About No. 1, both ancient documents and modern scholars are evenly divided. The Revisers' reading is given without note by Tregelles and in the text of Westcott: the displaced reading, in the margin of Westcott and in the texts of Lachmann and Tischendorf. Internal evidence perhaps favours slightly the Revisers' choice.

But the uncertainty of the reading should have been noted in their margin. The omission in No. 3 is supported by the Vat. and Sinai MSS. and a few cursives, and by Irenæus, Clement, Origen, Augustine, and Jerome. The omitted word is found in all other uncials and most cursives, and in the oldest and best versions. It is omitted by Tischendorf and Westcott; and is marked as doubtful by Lachmann and Tregelles. Probability seems to incline to the Revisers' choice. But confident decision is impossible; and unimportant. In Nos. 3, 4 the testimony of the Fathers is unusually trustworthy because the quotations found in existing copies of their writings contradict the readings current when these copies were made.

3. The most important reading open to doubt in the Epistle to the Galatians is ch. iv. 25, where the Revisers' margin records an alternative as read by "many ancient authorities." See my note. Amid the utter confusion of ancient documents and the conflicting opinions of Critical Editors, the reading of the Revisers' text seems to me to have a slight balance of probability. But certain decision is impossible. The only other similar marginal note is in ch. iv. 28, where the reading is quite uncertain and altogether unimportant.

Of the three alternatives noted in the Revisers' margin as read by "some ancient authorities," viz. i. 3, 8, vi. 13, the reading in their text is in each case supported by evidence fairly preponderant. Of these, only the last is important.

4. The only readings worthy of mention and not noted by the Revisers are:—

1. Ch. i. 15: *him* for *God*.
2. ,, ,, 17: *went away* for *went up*.
3. ,, ii. 12: *he came* for *they came*.
4. ,, ,, 20: *God and Christ* for *the Son of God*.
5. ,, iii. 21: *in law* for *from law*. (RV. *of the law*.)
6. ,, iv. 19: *children* for *little children*.
7. ,, v. 7: *truth* instead of *the truth*.
8. ,, v. 20: *jealousy* for *jealousies*.
9. ,, vi. 2: *ye will fulfil* for *fulfil*.
10. ,, ,, 18: *the* for *our*.

Nos. 3, 4 are very interesting variations, and are given by Lachmann without note and in the text of Tregelles. But documentary evidence condemns the latter: and internal improbability, in conjunction with the likelihood of its being copied from *v.* 11,

discredits the former. Both are rejected by Tischendorf, and without note by Westcott. No. 3 is the only reading in this Epistle certainly wrong and yet supported by the joint testimony of the Vat. and Sinai MSS. With these agree the Clermont MS. Greek and Latin, and the Greek part of two later Greco-Latin copies and the Latin part of one of them; and undoubtedly Origen, who interprets it to mean that James himself came to Antioch. This is one of the very few cases in which an early error crept into the oldest and best copies but disappears entirely from later copies. The other reading, which we are compelled to accept, is supported by the Alexandrian and Ephraim MSS. and almost all the Greek cursives, and by the very valuable Coptic (Egyptian) version, the Latin Vulgate, and the Syriac versions. In Nos. 1, 2, the overlooked readings are supported by the Vat. MS. and the Syriac version, but have (especially No. 1) rather stronger documentary evidence against them. The unimportant variation in No. 5 is found apparently only in the Vat. MS. and a quotation in Cyril; but is preferred by Westcott. In No. 6, the rejected reading is again supported by the Vat. and Sinai MSS.: but internal probability is against it. See notes. In No. 7, a reading probably correct is passed over by the Revisers: see note. But the difference is hardly perceptible in an English Version. In No. 8, documentary evidence is fairly divided. The overlooked reading is given without note by all Editors, except in the margin of Westcott. It is quite unimportant. In No. 9, there is perhaps a slight preponderance of documentary evidence for the reading retained by the Revisers. The variation in No. 10 is noted only in the margin of Westcott. It is found in the Sinai MS. and one later uncial; but is rejected by all other documents.

It will be observed that the readings passed over by the Revisers are without exception unimportant or improbable.

5. From the foregoing it appears that the only readings in the Epistle to the Galatians important and yet open to doubt are in chs. i. 11, 15, 17; iv. 25, 28; vi. 2, 13, 15. And of these the only one seriously affecting the course of Paul's argument is that in iv. 25. With these exceptions the Greek text adopted by the Revisers may be accepted with reasonable confidence as containing the actual words written by Paul.

6. In the REVISED VERSION of the Epistle to the Galatians among many improvements I note the following. The Greek

present tense is better reproduced in ch. i. 6, *ye are quickly removing*; *v.* 10, *if I were still pleasing men*; ii. 2, *should be running*; v. 2, *if ye receive circumcision*; vi. 13, *they who receive circumcision*. And these changes do more than appears at first sight to make clear the drift of the Epistle. The most important improvement is in v. 17, *that ye may not do the things that ye would*, instead of *so that ye cannot do, etc.* Paul's words denote, not an actual and necessary result, as the AV. suggests, but a constant tendency of the abiding opposition of the flesh and the Spirit. The rendering *Anathema* reprints in English letters a Greek word used in i. 8, 9 and in Rom. ix. 3, 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22, Acts xxiii. 14, itself a frequent rendering of a Hebrew word embodying a very definite O. T. conception, e.g. Lev. xxvii. 28, 29, Jos. vi. 17, 18, vii. 1. It thus does good service by reproducing a technical term. The rendering *live in faith* reproduces Paul's thought in ch. ii. 20 more correctly than *by faith*: as does *by the Spirit* instead of *in the spirit* in *v.* 16, and *in the Spirit* in *v.* 25. The renderings *manner of life* and *zealously seek you*, in i. 13, iv. 17, make obscure phrases clear. In iv. 13 the rendering, *because of an infirmity of the flesh* restores an historical reference hardly perceptible before. The rendering *kept in ward* in iii. 23 is both picturesque and exact: and *tutor* is probably the best English equivalent of the Greek word used in *v.* 24f. *Stood condemned* in ii. 11, *would cut themselves off* in v. 12, *with how large letters* in vi. 11, are more accurate renderings, and are of some importance.

The marginal note to i. 4 explaining *world* by *age* is very valuable.

Against these undeniable improvements, I can set, as in my view a change for the worse, only the phrase *faith in the Son of God* in ii. 20, which obscures somewhat the different construction in Paul and John of the word *faith*. See my *Romans*, p. 147.

The unsuitable use of the prepositions *of* and *unto*, where *from* or *by* and *for* would have been more accurate and more intelligible, already referred to in my *Corinthians*, p. 540, is found in the Epistle to the Galatians in iii. 18, 21, v. 15, vi. 8; and ii. 8, iii. 23. But the change in i. 1, *not from men* instead of *not of men*, in *v.* 12 *receive it from man* instead of *of man*, in v. 13 *for freedom* instead of *unto liberty*, are real gains.

On the whole it can hardly be denied that the thoughts which Paul wished to convey by this Epistle are reproduced much more correctly in the New than in the Old Version.

SECTION III.

THE GALATIANS AND THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

1. The name *Galatians* was given by the Greek historians and geographers, e.g. Polybius, Strabo, Pausanias, to a race which before the dawn of history occupied the whole apparently of what is now France. By still earlier writers the same people were called Kelts. So Herodotus, bk. ii. 33, iv. 49: "The Danube rises among the Kelts . . . who live outside the pillars of Hercules, and border the Kynesians, who of the inhabitants of Europe are furthest towards the setting sun." Similarly, Strabo (bk. iv. 1, p. 189) speaks of the people around Marseilles as being formerly called Kelts; and says that "all the Galatians were called Kelts by the Greeks." By Roman writers, e.g. Cæsar and Livy, the same people were usually called Gauls. So Cæsar, *Gallic War* bk. i. 1: "In their own language they are called Kelts; in ours Gauls." Whether the names Galatians or Gauls, and Kelts, were exactly synonymous, cannot now be determined with certainty.

2. The very close similarity between the Breton language which still survives in North-western France and the Welsh, assures us that the races separated for long centuries by the British Channel were originally one. And we cannot doubt that in France as in Britain this one language extended formerly much further east than it does now, until in France it was supplanted by the modified Latin we now call French and until in Britain both race and language were driven westward by the tide of Saxon and English invasion. Similarly, Varro, quoted by Jerome in his *Galatians*, (Pref. to bk. 2,) says that the people of Marseilles spoke three languages, Greek, Latin, Gallic. This last can only be the parent of the language still surviving in Brittany. We may therefore suppose that at the Christian era a nationality and language practically the same extended from the neighbourhood of Marseilles to the Forth and the Clyde. Of this nationality the tribes occupying France were known to Greek and Latin writers as Galatians and Gauls.

A stage further removed from Welsh and Breton than these one from the other, and yet akin, are the still more closely connected dialects surviving in Ireland, Man, and the Scotch Highlands. This more distant kinship is confirmed by the name

Gaelic, by which in some form for centuries this Northern branch of the Keltic language has been known, so similar to the name given by the Greeks and Latins to the Southern branch. But geographical reasons forbid us to doubt that the language of ancient Gaul was the parent, not of modern Gaelic, but of Breton.

3. The movements of the southern Kelts within historic times, we shall now trace. In B.C. 390, an irruption of Gauls, after occupying Northern Italy, attacked Rome and nearly destroyed the rising republic. In B.C. 280 another similar irruption poured into Macedonia and Greece, and was with difficulty repulsed from the national sanctuary at Delphi. Immediately afterwards a detachment of the same horde passed over the Hellespont, and spread through and ravaged Asia Minor as far as the Taurus mountains. Subsequently, their ravages were checked by surrounding kings, and the race confined to that central part of Asia Minor which received the permanent name of Galatia. Livy recounts (bk. 38) their subjection in B.C. 189 by the Roman consul Manlius. The fame of this Roman victory reached Judæa, and is recorded in 1 Maccabees viii. 2. Galatia then became an independent kingdom under the protection of Rome, until in B.C. 25 it was formed by Augustus, with the addition of Lycaonia and parts of Phrygia and Pisidia, into the Roman province of Galatia.

Since Derbe and Lystra, and apparently Iconium and Antioch in Pisidia, were within the Roman province of Galatia, although outside the country inhabited by the Keltic immigrants, we naturally ask whether the Christians in these cities were included in *the Churches of Galatia*. If so, we have in Acts xiii. 14—xiv. 23, xvi. 1—5 an account of the founding of the earliest of these Churches. But the description of these cities in xiv. 6 as 'cities of Lycaonia,' and the mention in xvi. 6, xviii. 23, along with Galatia, of Phrygia which was no Roman province but only a popular designation surviving from earlier times, suggests that also the term Galatia was used in its popular and older sense for the country of the Keltic settlers and that it did not include the Lycaonian cities.

4. Of Galatia, thus understood, the chief cities in Paul's day (so Strabo, bk. xii. 5, p. 567) were Tavium, Ancyra, and Pessinus. This last was the greatest commercial city of those parts. It was also famous as the chief seat of the worship of Cybelé, called in Galatia Agdistis, the mother of the gods, the most famous

goddess of all Western Asia; and formerly her priests were rulers of the city. Her worship was marked by wildest orgies and hideous mutilations. See under Gal. v. 12.

Of these cities, the second alone remains, under the modern name of Angora, containing now some 20,000 inhabitants, and famous for the beautiful silky hair of the Angora goats.

5. The similarity of name and the story of their migration assure us that the Galatian settlers in Asia Minor belonged to the race which from pre-historic times occupied France; that is, as we have seen, to the Southern branch of the great Keltic race. This is confirmed by Jerome, who tells us (*Epistle to the Galatians*, preface to bk. ii.) that the language of the Asiatic Galatians was almost the same as that spoken at Treves on the Moselle. For many centuries the people of Treves have been German. But we can easily believe that these supplanted, and drove West, earlier Keltic inhabitants, some of whom remained to Jerome's day. Certainly, this is easier than to suppose that the Asiatic Galatians were German, a suggestion almost destitute of other support. Jerome's remark proves that 300 years after Paul's day the European settlers in Asia Minor clung to their own language; and therefore formed a distinct element of the population.

That the ancient Galatians or Gauls were allied to the modern Keltic races, is confirmed by the scanty remains of their language, chiefly proper names. One example will suffice. When the Gauls poured over the Alps and attacked Rome, and when a hundred years later they entered Greece, their king is in each case called, by the Latin and Greek historians, Brennus. The sameness of name indicates an official title. Its meaning is found in 'Brenin,' the common Welsh word for 'king.' These various indications make it quite possible that Paul heard in Galatia a language closely akin to that spoken to-day among the mountains of Wales.

On the nationality of the Galatians, see a very able dissertation in Lightfoot's *Galatians*.

The character of the European and Asiatic Galatians or Gauls is drawn with great clearness and agreement by many ancient writers: e.g. Cæsar, *Gallic War* bk. iv. 5. They are represented as very eager and bold in a new thing or a first assault, but lacking perseverance, as ready to learn but incapable of prolonged application; and as given to intemperance, avarice, and superstition. And the eagerness and inconstancy of Paul's

readers (cp. i. 6, iv. 14f) are the chief features reflected on the pages of this Epistle.

6. With the Keltic race must have been intermingled in Asiatic Galatia surrounding nationalities. Doubtless there were, as everywhere in Asia Minor, men of Greek race and culture. And from Josephus (*Antiquities* bk. xii. 3. 4) we learn that many Jewish families had settled in the neighbourhood of Galatia. Descendants of the original Phrygian inhabitants would not be wanting. And, at least in the chief centres, the ruling Roman race would be. Probably among all these the Keltic race, which had given its name to the country, would predominate.

7. Very scanty is our knowledge of Paul's intercourse with the Galatians earlier than this letter. In Acts xvi. 6 we find that, on his second missionary journey, after visiting Derbe and Lystra, and doubtless Iconium, and Antioch in Pisidia, he 'passed through the Phrygian and Galatian country'; a reason being that he was prevented by the Holy Spirit from preaching in the Roman province (cp. Acts xx. 18) of Asia, of which the capital was Ephesus. This hindrance implies that Paul intended to go there. And, if so, his route from Lycaonia would lead him through the country popularly known as Phrygia. From this we infer that the change of route caused by the Spirit's hindrance was that, instead of going on westward to Ephesus, Paul turned north-eastward to Galatia. From Galatia he travelled westward to Mysia; and intended then to go northward to Bithynia. But the Spirit again hindered him; and he came down to Troas and passed over to Europe. The narrative of the Book of Acts makes us almost certain that this was Paul's first visit to Galatia. And, that in Acts xviii. 23 we find him confirming disciples in Galatia and Phrygia, implies that on a former visit, as we might well expect, he preached the Gospel there. We have no reason to doubt that these two visits to Galatia are the visit mentioned, and the second visit implied, in Gal. iv. 13. See notes. If so, Paul's first visit to Galatia resulted from divine overruling of his totally different purpose: his sojourn there was prolonged by serious and humiliating sickness: and the visit thus painfully prolonged occasioned the founding of the Churches to which he now writes.

In the scanty record (Acts xviii. 23) of Paul's second visit, Galatia is put after Phrygia. And naturally so. For he was then (*v.* 21) under promise to visit Ephesus: and for this it was most convenient to go from Lycaonia at once northward to

Galatia, and then through Phrygia to Ephesus. About this second visit to Galatia we have no details. But from Gal. v. 21 we infer that then Paul found occasion for warnings against immorality.

That no city of Galatia is mentioned as visited by Paul, suggests that the Galatian Christians were not chiefly in one or other of the three large cities, but were scattered throughout the country. See under Gal. i. 2.

We have not for the Epistle to the Galatians the definite notes of time and place which enabled us to determine approximately and with some confidence the date and place of the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. Such notes of time as we have, we shall discuss in Diss. iii., after our study of the Epistle itself.

The occasion and purpose of the Epistle are indicated plainly in Gal. i. 6, 7, iii. 1, iv. 11—20, v. 3, vi. 12. Paul wrote to recall his converts from an error spreading among them, under the influence of men whom he carefully distinguishes from those to whom he writes. How serious was the error, we learn from the earnestness of the Epistle. Its exact nature can be discovered only from the Epistle itself. Our study of it must therefore be postponed to the close of our Exposition.

EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

SECTION I.

APOSTOLIC GREETING TO THE GALATIAN CHRISTIANS.

CH. I. 1—5.

[1] Paul, an apostle, not from men nor through man but through Jesus Christ and God, the *Father, who raised Him from* the *dead,* [2] *and all the brethren with me, to the Churches of Galatia:* [3] *grace to you and peace from God,* the *Father, and our Lord, Jesus Christ,* [4] *who gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of God, our Father,* [5] *to whom* be *the glory for the ages of the ages. Amen.*

1. *Apostle*: see under *v.* 19, 1 Cor. xv. 7, Rom i. 1. *Not from men*; as though some body of men delegating to him authority were the starting point of Paul's apostolic journeys. Cp. Jno. i. 24. [So 1 Pet. i. 12; Acts xi. 11; Jno. i. 6.] *Men*, not 'man:' for it was inconceivable that Paul was sent by any one man. *Through* (see Rom. i. 5) *man:* i.e. 'through the agency or instrumentality of a man'; as Elisha (1 Kgs. xix. 16) was called to be a prophet by the agency of Elijah. Yet Elisha was sent from God, and was endowed with His authority. But so completely independent of everyone on earth was Paul's apostleship that it was not even conveyed to him by human lips. This complete and emphatic and repeated denial, we shall find (cp. *v.* 11f) to be Paul's chief thought throughout DIV. 1. So fully does it occupy his mind while writing, that it finds utterance in the first line of the Epistle.

But through Jesus Christ: Rom. i. 5, 1 Cor. viii. 6: the

channel of all good from God to us. These words are expounded in the narrative of Acts xxvi. 17f. That *Jesus Christ* is placed in emphatic contrast to *man* and is linked under one preposition with God, reveals His absolute and infinite superiority, in Paul's thought, to the entire human race, and His nearness to God. See my *Romans*, Diss. i. 7. The word 'man' in 1 Tim. ii. 5, Acts xvii. 31, presents no difficulty: for in Gal. i. 1 the same word is negatived simply as not being a full description of Him through whom Paul received the apostleship.

God, the Father: Eph. vi. 23, Phil. ii. 11, Col. iii. 17, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 2, Tit. i. 4. The title *Father* is added, not to distinguish God the Father from God the Son, as in theological phrase, but to declare that *God* is also *Father*. The following words suggest that Paul thinks of Him chiefly as Father of Christ. But the close relation between Christ and His followers as sharers of His sonship suggests at once that *God* is also their *Father*. *Through . . . God, the Father*: through the agency, i.e. the immediate activity, not only of *Christ* but of *God*. The Father was Himself the medium (as well as the source) and the instrument or agent (as well as the First Cause) of Paul's mission. For (Rom. xi. 36) 'All things are' both 'from Him and through Him.' In other words, God rose as it were from His throne and by His personal action invested Paul with the apostleship; the greatest conceivable proof of its importance. It is needless to add that God is also the source of Paul's commission: for we cannot conceive Him acting as agent for another. Hence we have no 'from God' corresponding to *not from men*. These last words were needful to rebut (so *v.* 11f) a reproach of Paul's enemies. Cp. 'an heir through God,' in ch. iv. 7.

That Paul's apostleship was *through* the agency of *Christ*, is self-evident: but that it was *through . . . God, the Father*, requires further explanation. This is given in the following words, *who raised Him from the dead*. These words, thrust prominently forward in the first verse of the Epistle, reveal the importance in Paul's thought of this great fact and its essential connection with the mission of the apostles. By the Risen Saviour, Paul was sent. Had He not risen, there had been no voice on the way to Damascus; and no apostolic mission. And, had not the apostles been sent to preach, the resurrection of Christ would have been without result. Therefore, when raising Christ by His own immediate power and without any human agent, with a view to the proclamation of the Gospel throughout the world, God

was Himself personally taking part in the mission of the apostles. Paul thus begins his letter of rebuke by bringing his readers into the presence of the infinite power of God manifested on earth, thus raising at once the question at issue above man and all that man can do. Cp. Rom. i. 4.

From the dead: or, literally and more forcefully, *from among dead-ones*, among whom Christ lay in death.

2. *All the brethren with me:* Paul's companions, probably, in travel and Gospel work. So Phil. iv. 21, where they are contrasted with 'all the saints.' For, Paul would hardly speak of the whole Church from whose midst he wrote as being with him: rather, he was with them. But, of the band of fellow-travellers, he was indisputably the centre. They were probably in part those mentioned in Acts xx. 4. See Diss. i. This mention of these fellow-workers implies that they recognised unanimously Paul's apostolic commission as from God and independent of human authority. And this recognition by them, known as they doubtless were and respected in Galatia, could not but influence the readers of this Epistle. Not that Paul's authority rested upon its recognition even by these good men. His reference to them merely suggests that they who reject it thereby separate themselves from this band of noble workers.

The Churches of Galatia: close coincidence with 1 Cor. xvi. 1, Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23, where no city is mentioned. This suggests that Christianity had not spread from one centre, as it did from Corinth and Ephesus, (contrast 2 Cor. i. 1,) over the whole province. The reason is hidden under the obscurity which veils the origin of these Churches. These words also suggest that the Christian communities in *Galatia* were not united into one organic whole. And this accords with the fact that, except Acts ix. 31, 'the Church throughout Judæa and Samaria,' we never find the Churches of a province spoken of as one Church.

3. See under Rom. i. 7. The words *to you* between *grace* and *peace* detain our attention and mark off each as a distinct object of thought. *Father:* as in *v.* 1, and perhaps prompted by the phrase there. But here the foregoing words suggest that Paul thinks chiefly of *God* as *Father* of His people. The RV. margin has equal documentary evidence, but might easily be an imitation of Paul's usual salutation. Notice that, as in *v.* 1 *Christ* and *God* are joined together under one preposition as agent of Paul's apostleship, so here as the source of *grace and peace.*

4*a*. An historical fact touching Christ, followed in *v.* 4*b* by an eternal truth touching God, these underlying and prompting the foregoing good wish. *Gave Himself:* 1 Tim. ii. 6, Tit. ii. 14, Eph. v. 2, 25, Rom. viii. 32, iv. 25: i.e. undoubtedly, gave Himself up to die. Cp. Gal. ii. 20 with 21: Mt. xx. 28, Mk. x. 45, Lk. xxii. 19, Jno. vi. 51. For Christ's death stood in special relation to *our sins:* 1 Cor. xv. 3, Rom. iv. 25, 1 Pet. iii. 18. Cp. 1 Maccabees vi. 44, where of Eleazar's heroic death in battle we read: "and gave himself to save his people and to preserve for himself an eternal name." The phrase suggests that a man's life is his greatest conceivable gift, and includes all other possible gifts. *For our sins*: literally *touching our sins*. Another reading with less documentary evidence, and no better internal probability, is *on behalf of our sins*, as in 1 Cor. xv. 3. The whole clause receives its only and sufficient explanation in the teaching of Rom. iii. 24—26 (see note) that Christ was 'set forth in His blood' in order to reconcile with the justice of God, and thus make possible, the justification of believers, i.e. the pardon of their sins.

That He might: or *may*. The Greek does not suggest whether this purpose of Christ's self-surrender is, or is not, already accomplished. *The age:* Rom. xii. 2, 1 Cor. i. 20: the whole course and current of things around except so far as these are controlled by Christ, looked upon as existing and moving in time and for a time. *Evil:* actually hurtful: same word in Eph. v. 16, vi. 13; often used of Satan, Eph. vi. 16, 2 Thess. iii. 3, 1 Jno. ii. 13f, iii. 12, v. 18f. *The present age* is injurious in its influence. The word rendered *present* denotes sometimes, as in 2 Thess. ii. 2, that which stands before us as now beginning or about to begin. But elsewhere (Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26, Heb. ix. 9) it has the simple sense of *present* in contrast to something future. And so probably here: for although Paul speaks often (Rom. xii. 2, 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6, 8, 2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. i. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 10, Tit. ii. 12) of the age in which he lived, he never suggests that any other age will begin earlier than that (Eph. ii. 7) which will be ushered in by the return of Christ. *The present age*, is stronger than 'this age'; and pictures the mass of things moving around us which ever tends to carry us along in its own direction as if, changing the metaphor, standing in our midst and face to face of us. Christ's purpose to *deliver us* implies that the current around is a force carrying us to destruction, and from which we cannot rescue

ourselves. Indisputably, the influences of the world around are a current, more tremendous than the rapids of Niagara, carrying to ruin all except those whom Christ saves. And the mention of *our sins* suggests that surrender to this current is the due punishment of sin. Into this seething whirlpool Christ flung Himself that He might rescue us from it.

4b, 5. The purpose of Christ's historic self-surrender accords with, and therefore realises, *the* eternal *will of God*. Cp. Eph. i. 5, 11. Thus, as ever, Paul rises from the Son to the Father. Grammatically we might with RV. render *our God and Father;* or, as in the American Revisers' margin, *God and our Father*, or rather in idiomatic English *God our Father*. Since the word *God* does not need a defining genitive, in order to convey a complete idea, whereas the idea of *Father* is essentially relative and therefore needs a complement expressed or understood, the latter renderings seem to me to convey more probably Paul's exact thought. The whole title declares that He who reigns supreme as *God* is *also our Father*. And in the presence of God, in view of His Fatherhood and of His eternal purpose of salvation, Paul cannot refrain from an outburst of praise. So Rom. i. 25, 2 Cor. xi. 31. The grandeur revealed in our rescue from the course of things around, by the self-surrender of Christ, belongs, and will be for ever ascribed, to our Father God.

Taking up his pen to write to the Galatians, Paul's first thought, forced upon him by the reproach of enemies, is that his apostleship, so far from being of human origin, is independent even of human agency; that it was committed to him by the immediate action of Christ and of God. This is acknowledged by all his companions in evangelical labour. To men constitutionally prone to be carried away by surrounding influences, Paul intimates that these influences are bad, that surrender to them is a result of our sins, and that to rescue us from them Christ gave Himself to die, in accordance with an eternal purpose of God. This proves the deadly nature of these surrounding influences, and the earnestness of Christ and of God to save us from them. The splendour of God revealed in this deliverance will, as Paul desires, shine forth for ever.

In § 1 we have the great historic fact that Christ rose from the dead on which rests the faith which justifies; and the great doctrine that salvation comes through Christ's death, which harmonises justification by faith with the justice of God. We have no hint that either the fact or doctrine was questioned by

Paul's opponents. He therefore begins his letter by bringing his readers into the presence of truths which they admit and which are a firm foundation for the argument which follows.

SECTION II.

THE EARLY APOSTACY OF THE GALATIAN CHRISTIANS.

CH. I. 6—10.

I wonder that ye are so quickly removing from Him that called you in the *grace of Christ, to another kind of good tidings; 7which is not another* good tidings, *except that there are some who are disturbing you and wishing to overturn the good tidings of Christ. 8But even if we or an angel out of heaven announce good tidings to you other than the good tidings we announced to you, let him be anathema. 9As we have before said, also now again I say, if any one is announcing to you good tidings other than ye received, let him be anathema. 10For, now,* is it *men I am persuading, or God? Or am I seeking to please men? If I were still pleasing men, Christ's servant I should not be.*

In § 2 we have the subject-matter of the Epistle, viz. an early defection in Galatia and efforts there to overturn the Gospel; *vv.* 6, 7: Paul's condemnation of the false teaching; *vv.* 8, 9: his justification of the disregard of human approval which this condemnation involves; *v.* 10.

Instead of thanks to God, as in all his other letters to Churches, Paul's salutation is at once followed by severe blame. His *wonder* (cp. Mk. vi. 6, 1 Jno. iii. 13) tells how unusual is the conduct blamed; and thus adds severity to this rebuke. *So quickly;* denotes either (cp. Lk. xiv. 21) a rapid defection now going on; or defection after (1 Cor. iv. 19) a short interval, measured here either from the arrival of the false teachers, or from Paul's last visit, or from his readers' conversion. Paul's exact thought, we cannot determine with certainty. Even the last measurement would give a space of seven years at most. And this is a very short time for steadfastness which is worthless unless it endure till death and for a Church designed long to outlive the longest lived of its members. Consequently, this word

affords no sure note of the time when the Epistle was written. See Diss. iii. 3. *Removing:* migration from place to place, or change of opinion. So Acts vii. 16, Heb. xi. 5: also 2 Macc. vii. 24, of an apostate Jew; and Sirach vi. 9, of a friend turned to an enemy. *Ye-are-removing:* defection now going on while Paul writes, and not yet complete. This agrees with the present tense in ch. iii. 3, 'are-being-made-perfect'; iv. 9, 'are-turning'; v. 4, 'are-being-justified'; and throughout the Epistle, e.g. iv. 21, v. 1, 2, 3, 12, vi. 12, 13. These present tenses and Paul's expression of wonder, suggest that he wrote while the sad news was still fresh; and while the apostacy was still going on, hoping thus to stay its progress.

Him that called you: God, as always with Paul: cp. v. 8; i. 15, 1 Cor. vii. 17, Rom. viii. 30. These words remind us that the Gospel is the voice of God calling men to Himself; and imply that to forsake Gospel truth is to forsake God. For the Gospel call is the medium through which God presents Himself to us, and the instrument by which He draws us and binds us to Himself. *In* the *grace* of *Christ:* Rom. v. 15: cp. Gal. vi. 18, 2 Cor. viii. 9, xii. 9, xiii. 13. The Gospel call comes to us accompanied and surrounded by the undeserved favour which moved Christ to give Himself for our salvation. Apart from this favour, there had been no Gospel. Thus these words bring *v.* 4 to bear upon the apostacy of the Galatians.

To another-kind-of Gospel, or *a different Gospel:* 2 Cor. xi. 4: point towards which, while forsaking God, they are moving. The call of God was good news of coming deliverance: and nothing less than this could meet the case of men carried helplessly to ruin by the present evil age. Therefore, since his readers are turning from God who spoke to them these good tidings, Paul assumes in irony that they must have heard other good news. And, if so, it must have been of a kind quite different from that which they heard from Paul. He thus compares his own teaching with that which his opponents would put in its place, each being looked upon as good news.

In the words *called you, in* the *grace of Christ, another Gospel*, we trace at once the pen of the author of the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians.

7. Explanation of the foregoing veiled comparison. '*Which* other kind of good tidings, as I have ventured to call this false teaching, *is not* really *another* good tidings, as though there could be two announcements of coming deliverance between which we

might choose. It is, therefore, no Gospel at all. My own words are not correct *except* as pointing to the fact *that there are some who disturb you, etc.*' *Disturb:* to destroy one's peace: so v. 10, Acts xv. 24, xvii. 8, Jno. v. 7, xii. 27, xiii. 21, xiv. 1, 27. Who and how many the disturbers were, we are not told: simply the fact of disturbance is asserted. *Gospel of Christ:* Rom. xv. 19, (i. 9,) 1 Cor. ix. 12, 2 Cor. ii. 12, ix. 13, x. 14: the good news about Christ. For Christ is present to our thought rather as the Great Matter, than as Author or Herald, of the Gospel. Cp. Rom. i. 2, 2 Cor. iv. 4. *Overturn the Gospel:* the tendency, if not the deliberate aim, of the false teachers; so utterly opposed is their teaching to the good news about Christ. They were already *disturbing* Paul's readers; and were *wishing to overturn the Gospel.* This last, they endeavour to do by putting in its place something quite different from it. The new teaching, in order to contrast it with the teaching it was designed to supersede, Paul calls in *v.* 6 'another kind of Gospel.' And only in this sense does he use this phrase.

The matter of the Epistle is now fairly before us, viz. an early defection in Galatia. And the teaching which caused it, Paul declares to be an attempt to overturn the Gospel. To prove this assertion, will be the chief purpose of his argument.

8, 9. This argument, Paul delays for a moment in order to pronounce, and to repeat, against the false teachers in Galatia the most tremendous condemnation possible. He thus reveals the greatness of the issues at stake in the argument he is about to begin.

Even if we, etc.: an almost inconceivable supposition, giving to the condemnation which follows the widest application possible, and thus greatly increasing its force. *We:* Paul and the brethren with him. *Angel out of heaven:* graphic picture of the appearance of an angel. *Other than, etc.:* limited, by Paul's reference to men who desired to overturn the Gospel, to teaching contrary to, and therefore subversive of, the Gospel preached by Paul. This fearful condemnation therefore does not beat upon merely defective teaching. Even the man who builds (1 Cor. iii. 15) with straw may himself be saved; so long as he does not endeavour to overturn the foundation. *Anathema:* see under Rom. ix. 3. It can denote no less than the actual curse of God. Under this curse Paul declares that the false teachers lie; and approves this. To this terrible condemnation, the repetition in *v.* 9 adds great force.

The contrast with *I say now* implies that *as we said before*, does not refer to *v.* 8, and must therefore refer to words spoken by Paul and his companions either in an earlier letter or on an earlier visit. It is perhaps most easily explained as recalling Paul's second visit to Galatia, recorded in Acts xviii. 23. But the prevalence of the error in question, and the important discussion of it at Jerusalem shortly before (Acts xvi. 6) Paul's first visit, and the decrees which (*v.* 4) on that journey he circulated, make it quite possible that this warning was given by him even when founding the Galatian Churches. That *if any one is announcing, etc.* states actual fact, we infer confidently from *v.* 7. It is thus a contrast to the inconceivable supposition of *v.* 8. [Hence the change in the Greek moods.] The changed ending of the conditional clause, *that which ye received*, brings as evidence against themselves the readers' own previous acceptance of Paul's teaching. Cp. 1 Cor. xv. 1. It is thus a forerunner of ch. iii. 1.

That this tremendous condemnation is due to narrow intolerance of opinions different from his own, Paul's breadth of view disclosed throughout the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians forbids us to believe. We are therefore compelled to accept it as proof of the greatness of the error and the guilt of the men referred to. And we wait, with bated breath, to know what their teaching was. We expect to find it directly subversive (*v.* 7) of the Gospel, thus tending to rob the world of the blessings therein proclaimed and conveyed; and to find that it implied wilful rejection of the teaching of Christ. For, only against error involving moral guilt could this fearful curse be pronounced. Thus Paul's words of condemnation raise our expectation, on the threshold of the Epistle, to the highest point.

The nature of the error here referred to can be gathered only by inference from the Epistle itself. It will be discussed fully at the close of our exposition. See note there.

10. *Now:* in emphatic prominence, revealing the importance of the present moment, and the mighty issues *now* at stake. *Persuade:* win over to our side as friends; same word in Acts xii. 20. 'Is it at this present time the favour of men or of God I am securing?' *To please men:* 1 Thess. ii. 4: method by which we *persuade* them. While *seeking to please* them we are actually engaged in the work of winning them to our side. That Paul actually persuaded (2 Cor. v. 11) men and sought (Rom. xv. 2, 1 Cor. x. 33) to please them, in order to save them, implies

that he refers here to the favour of men sought only for our own selfish ends. To seek the favour of men in order to save them, and only so far as this motive leads us, is itself one of the best means of obtaining the favour of God. Between these two modes of pleasing men, the ultimate aim places an infinite difference.

To the questions of *v.* 10*a*, *v.* 10*b* gives both an answer and a reason for it. *Still;* suggests that Paul, like all men, had once made the favour of men his main purpose. Apart from Christ, success in life depends more or less on men around us. Consequently, the favour of some of them must at all costs be obtained. Consciousness of this is bondage to the caprice of those on whom our supposed welfare depends. But Christ's servants know that their welfare depends only on their Master's smile. They are therefore independent of men, and have no need to seek man's favour except so far as by doing so they are serving and pleasing Christ. Consequently, to *please men* as we did in days gone by, is to abandon the liberty of *a servant of Christ*. Compare carefully 1 Cor. vii. 23. The conspicuous contrast of *men* and *Christ* involves, as in ch. i. 1, the superhuman dignity of Christ.

Verse 10 is given to support *v.* 9. The support thus rendered, our ignorance of details somewhat obscures. But a clue is found in vi. 12, where Paul declares that zeal for the Law was a mask under which the disturbers were endeavouring to escape from persecution. If so, they were mutilating the Gospel in order to conciliate its enemies. Such conduct is doubly incompatible with the service of Christ; and justifies the severe condemnation of *v.* 10. By using the first person, and thus expounding the principles of his own action, in words which his readers knew were true, Paul brings his own contrary example to bear on the matter at issue. Cp. 1 Cor. viii. 13, ix. 26, x. 33, xi. 1. He also reveals by silent contrast the selfish motives of the seducers. His reference to himself is also a suitable stepping-stone to DIV. I.

DIVISION I.

PAUL'S CONTRARY CONDUCT AND PRINCIPLES.

CHAPTERS I. 11—II.

SECTION III.

PAUL'S GOSPEL IS DIVINE.

CH. I. 11, 12.

For I make known to you, brethren, the good tidings announced as good tidings by me, that it is not according to man. 12 *For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it; but* it came *through revelation of Jesus Christ.*

Make known to you: calls attention to an important matter, as in 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 1. It also suggests that the error in Galatia arose from ignorance. *Good-tidings, announce good-tidings:* same word already five times in § 2, reminding us emphatically that the preaching of Paul was good news. *That it is not, etc.:* special element in the *good tidings* which Paul wishes to *make known*. *Not according to man:* it is not such teaching as man could produce, does not correspond with man's powers. This calls attention to the nature and contents of Paul's Gospel.

12. Explains how it is that Paul preached a Gospel which does not accord with, i.e. which surpasses, man's own powers of intellectual discovery. The explanation is that it was *received* not *from man* but from *Christ*. Paul did not receive it from human lips, as something which one man hands over to another. *Nor was I taught it:* as something acquired by the intellectual effort of learning. *Revelation* (see under Rom. i. 17) *of Jesus Christ:* either as the Author, Himself revealing, Mt. xi. 27; or the Object-matter, Himself revealed, 1 Cor. i. 7, 1 Pet. i. 7, 13. Here Gal. i. 16 suggests the latter thought: and this

is the usual sense of the genitive after *revelation*. But the contrast with *received from man* reminds us that *Jesus Christ* is the source of this *revelation*. And this is possibly the sense of 2 Cor. xii. 1. Both ideas may have been present in Paul's mind. The *Revelation of Christ* in 1 Cor. i. 7 is His sudden unveiling at the Great Day: here, and in *v.* 16, it is His unveiling subjectively in the mind of Paul. Cp. Rom. xvi. 25, Eph. iii. 5.

The statements in *vv.* 11, 12 are given in support of something going before. And the repeated word *good-tidings*, or *Gospel*, at once recalls the same word in *vv.* 6, 7, 8, 9, thus overleaping the passing reference in *v.* 10. Paul assumed in *v.* 7 that the good news which he proclaimed and his readers accepted, but which the disturbers wish to overturn, is 'The Gospel of Christ.' To defend this assumption, is the purpose of DIV. I. And this defence Paul has now introduced by a statement, which he will at once proceed to prove, that the matter of his preaching was acquired not by ordinary means but by a lifting up of the veil which hides Christ from mortal view.

The above statement and the long argument following, which shed light on *v.* 1, can be explained only by supposing that the false teachers had insinuated that Paul received the Gospel at second hand and preached only in virtue of a commission from the apostles sent personally by Christ, and was therefore inferior to them; and that to their commission he had been unfaithful by preaching a Gospel different from that which he received from them. To this insinuation the facts which occupy the remainder of DIV. I. will be a crushing reply.

This revelation was conveyed to Paul (Eph. iii. 5) by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit (Eph. i. 17) of wisdom and revelation, received at Damascus by (Acts ix. 17) the agency of Ananias. And doubtless the revelation was progressive. Yet we may suppose that he sought and received from others an account of the works and words of Jesus. Indeed he may have known these in part before his conversion; as many know them now and are uninfluenced by them. But, in addition to this external knowledge, Paul was deeply conscious that by the direct agency of God the eyes of his heart had been opened to see a heavenly light and to apprehend the life-giving truths underlying the words and works of Christ. And this is true, in some measure, of all believers: cp. Eph. i. 17. Probably the matters in dispute turned not so much on what Christ had said as on the underlying significance

of His words. And of this, Paul's knowledge was derived, not from human witnesses, but from Him who was 'pleased to reveal His Son in' him.

SECTION IV.

PAUL'S FORMER LIFE.

CH. I. 13, 14.

For ye have heard my manner of life formerly in Judaism, that beyond measure I was persecuting the Church of God, and was laying it waste: "and I was making progress in Judaism beyond many of my own age in my race, being more abundantly zealous for my paternal traditions.

Now begins historical proof, occupying the rest of DIV. I., of the statement in *v.* 12. As a dark background for it, throwing into bold relief his subsequent career, Paul describes first his own earlier life. And this description is also the beginning of the proof. For, such terrible hostility could be overcome by nothing less than a 'revelation of Jesus Christ.' *Ye have heard:* probably from Paul himself; a coincidence with Acts xxii., xxvi., which reveal Paul's habit of narrating his conversion. *Manner of life:* same word in Eph. iv. 22, 1 Tim. iv. 12; 2 Cor. i. 12, Eph. ii. 3, 1 Tim. iii. 15. *Judaism:* the Jewish way of living, especially in religion. So 2 Macc. viii. 1, "those who had remained *in Judaism*," in contrast to apostates; ii. 21, xiv. 38. *The Church of God:* cp. 1 Cor. xv. 9. To *persecute the Church* is to make war against *God*. *Was-laying-waste:* *v.* 23: was engaged in its utter destruction. Paul looked upon himself then as actually destroying the Church. The same word is used for destruction of cities; and, in Acts ix. 21, of persons.

14. *Making progress:* same word in Rom. xiii. 12: literally *knocking forward*, laboriously making oneself a way. In everything distinctive of a Jew, especially in fanatical devotion to the Law and to Jewish prerogatives, Paul was day by day going forward. This devotion, *many* other young men shared: but in his fervour he left them behind. *In my race:* 2 Cor. xi. 26, Phil. iii. 5. It suggests or implies that those to whom Paul wrote were for the more part not Jews. *Zealous:* emulous to maintain and defend: literally *a zealot*, which is an English

form of the Greek word here used. Same word in Lk. vi. 15, Acts i. 13; xxi. 20, xxii. 3, 1 Cor. xiv. 12, Tit. ii. 14, 1 Pet. iii. 13. Of the same word, Cananæan in (RV.) Mt. x. 4, Mk. iii. 18 is a Hebrew form. It became the name of a sect of fanatics madly jealous for what they thought to be the prerogatives of Israel. *Traditions:* customs or teaching handed down verbally or in writing from one to another. See under 1 Cor. xi. 2. Cp. Mk. vii. 3—13, Col. ii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6. *Paternal:* see Diss. i. 2. That Paul says *my traditions*, even when comparing himself with others of his own race, suggests that he refers to something specially his own, probably to the traditional customs and interpretations of Scripture which distinguished the sect of the Pharisees. For Paul was (Phil. iii. 5, Acts xxvi. 5) a Pharisee, a son (xxiii. 6) of Pharisees. So Josephus, *Antiquities* bk. xiii. 10. 6, "The Pharisees handed over by tradition to the people many ordinances received from the fathers": ch. 16. 2, "the ordinances which the Pharisees brought in according to the paternal tradition." A sample is in Mk. vii. 3—13.

Notice that Paul's words about his earlier life here and 1 Cor. xv. 9, Phil. iii. 6, 1 Tim. i. 13 confirm completely the statements in Acts viii. 3, ix. 1, 13, xxii. 4, 19, xxvi. 10.

SECTION V.

PAUL'S CONVERSION AND JOURNEY TO ARABIA.

CH. I. 15—17.

But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me *through His grace,* [16] *to reveal His Son in me, that as good tidings I might announce Him among the Gentiles, immediately I did not set* the matter [16] *before flesh and blood,* [17] *nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia, and I returned again to Damascus.*

15, 16*a*. A new era in Paul's life, due entirely to the good pleasure of God, an historic realisation of an eternal purpose. *When it pleased God;* suggests that the time was chosen by the good will of God, who might have spoken to him earlier or later.

Separated me, etc.: 'placed me, from the moment of my birth, apart from other men,' i.e. in a unique position. This can refer only to the as yet unrevealed purpose of God. Paul cannot forget that the voice on the way to Damascus was a manifestation of a purpose which had followed him from the first moment of his personal existence. Even then God designed him for special work. Cp. Isa. xlix. 1, Jer. i. 5. *Called me:* Rom. viii. 28: by the voice of Jesus. This voice was the first link in the historic realisation of God's purpose. Cp. Rom. viii. 30. *Through His grace:* channel by which the voice came to Paul. God first looked on him with undeserved favour; and then, in order to place him in the unique position for which from birth He had destined him, He spoke to him on the journey. Notice the parallel: 'it pleased God to reveal His Son in me; and by His grace He called me.' *To reveal, etc.:* an inward unveiling and vision, in the heart of Paul, of the Son of God, of His Nature and Mission. See under *v.* 12. Thus to know Christ is the highest gain and joy, and would itself compensate for the lack of all besides. This revelation followed immediately Paul's reception of the Holy Spirit: for he at once (Acts ix. 20) began to preach. But it would be developed as day by day the Spirit gave him a nearer and clearer view of Christ. Paul then adds the definite purpose of this revelation. *In me:* in the mind and spiritual life of Paul; of which every part was permeated and ennobled by this vision of the unveiled face of Christ. It cannot refer, as in 1 Tim. i. 16, to an objective manifestation of Christ to men in (cp. Gal. i. 24) the person of Paul. For this would need to be clearly specified, would confound these words with those following, and would omit an all-important link of the chain, viz. Paul's own inward vision of Christ. For, none but those in whose inner life Christ is revealed can preach Him aright. The other idea, the word 'manifest' (2 Cor. iv. 10f) would better express.

Announce Him: for Christ is Himself the matter of the good news. *Among the Gentiles:* a definite element in God's purpose; and a close coincidence with Acts xxvi. 17.

16*b*, 17. Paul's action *immediately* after this divine revelation, described, as his wont is, first negatively then positively. *Set* the matter *before:* for advice, as though Paul's conduct would be influenced thereby. Same word in ii. 6: similar word in *v.* 2. *Flesh and blood:* men; whose intelligence is limited and their counsel moulded by the constitution of their material clothing. Cp. Mt. xvi. 17, Eph. vi. 12. Similarly, 1 Cor. xv. 50, Heb. ii. 14

recall the conditions imposed by man's bodily life. That Paul does not refer here to taking account of the needs and comfort of the body, is proved by his mention in *v.* 17 of the earlier apostles; and by the scope of DIV. I., viz. his independence of human authority. *Nor did I go up, etc.:* another negation specifying the former one. *Go up to Jerusalem:* ii. 1f, Acts xi. 2, xv. 2, xxi. 12; and xviii. 22, which refers probably to Jerusalem. It was not only the head of the nation, but was situated on high ground. On receiving the heavenly vision, Paul did not go to present himself to the Mother-Church of Christendom in the metropolis of his nation. Consequently, his success was in no way due to any commission from *those who were apostles before* him.

By going *into Arabia* instead of going *up to Jerusalem*, Paul *went away* from Christian counsellors. He went, probably, to the kingdom of Aretas, bordering Judæa, with Petra as capital. Cp. Josephus, *Antiquities* bk. xiv. 1. 4. This journey is most easily harmonised with Acts ix. 19f by supposing that immediately after his conversion Paul preached for a short time ('some days,' Acts ix. 19) in the synagogues at Damascus, and then went to Arabia; that after a short sojourn he returned to Damascus and stayed there a great part of the three years mentioned in Gal. i. 18; and that his departure from Damascus to Jerusalem was prompted, as narrated in Acts ix. 23ff and 2 Cor. xi. 33, by plots of the Jews. That the journey to Arabia is not mentioned in the Book of Acts, suggests that it was short, and thus perhaps unknown to the writer or omitted as unimportant. The purpose of the journey is not stated, and is unknown to us. Chrysostom and other early writers suppose that Paul went to Arabia, a Gentile country, to preach the Gospel there, thus beginning at once his destined work. If so, the temporary rule of Aretas over Damascus (see note under 2 Cor. xi. 32) may have afforded him a favourable opportunity of preaching in the capital of the Arabian kingdom. Or, in harmony with the deepest and noblest instincts of human nature, his sudden and wonderful change may have prompted Paul to seek retirement in order to ponder in the solitude of a foreign country the commission received from Christ. In this case, he may, like Elijah, have travelled as far as Sinai, which was included probably in the kingdom of Aretas: and to this visit may be due the allusion in ch. iv. 25. Between the above suggestions we cannot decide. Possibly, solitary contemplation in a land of strangers may have been combined with some measure of evangelical activity. In

either case Paul *went away* from christian counsellors: and this is the point he wishes to emphasise. *Again:* even from Arabia, which was nearer to Jerusalem than to Damascus, Paul simply retraced his steps *to Damascus.* These last words imply that his conversion was at Damascus, of which in this Epistle no other mention is made: an undesigned and important coincidence with Acts ix. 3.

SECTION VI.

PAUL'S VISIT TO, AND EARLY DEPARTURE FROM, JERUSALEM.

CH. I. 18—24.

Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem, to make acquaintance of Cephas; and I remained with him fifteen days. [19] *But no other of the Apostles did I see, except James, the brother of the Lord.* [20] *The things which I write to you, behold before God I do not lie.*

[21] *Then I came into the regions of Syria and of Cilicia.* [22] *And I was unknown by face to the Churches of Judæa, the* Churches *in Christ.* [23] *But only they were hearing that, He who persecuted us formerly now announces as good news the faith which formerly he was laying waste.* [24] *And they were glorifying God in me.*

18. *Then: vv.* 18, 21, ii. 1: three consecutive steps in the historic narrative. *After three years:* possibly only one whole year and parts of two others, as in Mt. xxvii. 63, Mk. viii. 31. They were measured probably from Paul's conversion, as is 'immediately' in *v.* 16. If the visit to Arabia was short, most of this time would be spent at Damascus, probably after Paul's return there. *To-make-acquaintance-of Cephas:* a purpose very different from a desire to obtain apostolic sanction for his work. *Cephas:* see under 1 Cor. i. 12. *Fifteen days:* exact length of a memorable visit, fixed indelibly in the mind of Paul. This short sojourn, sufficient to make acquaintance of Peter, would give no time for training in Gospel truth.

For the bearing of this verse on Acts ix. 17, 26, see Diss. i. 2.

19. *The brother of the Lord:* to distinguish this *James* from

(Acts xii. 2) the brother of John, who was not then put to death. *Except James:* or *but only James.* Grammatically the words so rendered do not necessarily imply that James was himself an apostle. See under ii. 16. But here Paul cannot wish to say that besides Peter he saw no one, or no Christian, at Jerusalem except James. Cp Acts ix. 28ff. And the whole context, which refers specially to *the apostles*, shows that to these the exception refers. It implies fairly that James, if not himself actually and usually called an apostle, was yet so closely related to the apostles that the statement that at Jerusalem Paul saw no apostle except Peter needed to be qualified by the statement that he also saw James. And this agrees exactly with the prominent position of James, attested by his mention in ch. ii. 9 before Peter and John. The apostles held (1 Cor. xii. 28) the first rank in the Church: and in the first rank stood certainly James. This lessens the apparent discrepancy in Acts ix. 27, by permitting us to speak of Peter and James as 'apostles.' The others, possibly, were away from Jerusalem on evangelical work.

20. This protestation (peculiar in N. T. to Paul: Rom. ix. 1, 2 Cor. xi. 31, 1 Tim. ii. 7) implies some difficulty, fancied or real, in the foregoing statement; and proves its great importance. It is most easily explained by supposing that Paul's opponents boldly asserted, or insinuated, in order to prove that he had been unfaithful, that he had received a formal commission from the whole apostolic band; and that from this he derived his authority in the Church. To contradict any such assertion, Paul assures us in these solemn words that his purpose in going to Jerusalem was to become acquainted with Peter, and that he saw there no other leader of the Church except James. Thus, by directing attention to a matter of importance, this apparently casual protest helps us to understand Paul's argument.

21—24. A third step in Paul's narrative, following (1) *vv.* 15—17 and (2) 18—20.

Syria and Cilicia: adjoining provinces, far from Jerusalem: mentioned together in the same order in Acts xv. 23, 41. Syria is put first as nearer to Jerusalem, and as the more important. See Diss. i. 2. From Tarsus Barnabas brought Paul to Antioch, the capital of Syria, where he laboured (Acts xi. 26) a whole year. Thus agree the statements here and in the Book of Acts. The indefinite term *regions of Syria, etc.* suggests various journeys within or around these provinces.

22. *The Churches of Judæa;* possibly do not include that at Jerusalem. For the people and life of the surrounding country are so different from those of a metropolis that the latter seems hardly to belong to the former: and it is not likely that Paul would be fifteen days in Jerusalem without meeting some Christians there. Similarly, from Jerusalem apparently (Jno. ii. 13) Jesus went (iii. 22) into 'the Judæan land.' Yet in 1 Thess. ii. 14, similar words certainly include Jerusalem. And it may be objected that if to these Paul was known it was immaterial to say that he had not visited the Churches in the small towns around. On the apparent contradiction with Acts ix. 28, see Diss. i. 2. Perhaps these words were added to complete the account of Paul's relations with the Jewish Christians, and to give opportunity for the statement in *v.* 24 of their accord with him. *The Churches in Christ:* a comment on these Judæan Christians, testifying their union with Christ and therefore the genuineness of their profession. So 1 Thess. ii. 14. The plural *Churches* suggests, as in ch. i. 2, that they were not united into one organised whole. *Unknown by face;* hardly implies that they had never seen his face even as a persecutor, and therefore does not prove that Paul refers only to Churches outside Jerusalem. For, if they had never met him as a Christian, he would be, as to personal intercourse, still unknown to them.

23, 24. The *only* contact of Paul with the Christians of Judæa was that from time to time news came that their *former* persecutor was *now* preaching the Gospel. Of this Gospel, *faith* was a chief element. (Another chief element was the Cross of Christ: 1 Cor. i. 18.) Paul announced *as-good-tidings* that God saves all who believe. *Formerly* he was at work crushing out this teaching by destroying (same word in *v.* 13, Acts ix. 21) those who announced it. Cp. Acts vi. 7, 'obeyed the faith'; Rom. i. 5. *Glorified:* see under Rom. i. 21, xv. 6, 9, 1 Cor. vi. 20. *In me:* Jno. xvii. 10. In the changed conduct of Paul there shone forth to the Christians of Judæa the grandeur of God, awakening their admiration. This was his earnest desire: 'that in my body Christ shall be magnified,' Phil. i. 20. Since this admiration was voluntary, they are said to have themselves *glorified God.* These words attest the agreement of the Judæan Christians with Paul at this early stage of his career, so far as he was known to them; and thus prepare the way for the formal agreement in § 7.

SECTION VII.

A SUBSEQUENT VISIT TO JERUSALEM.

CH. II. 1—10.

Then, fourteen years having elapsed, again I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking along with me also Titus. And I went up according to revelation; and I set before them the Gospel which I proclaim among the Gentiles, (privately, however, to those of repute,) lest in any way I should be running or have run in vain.

But not even Titus who was *with me,* he *being a Greek, was compelled to receive circumcision, and* that *because of the false brethren privately brought in, who came in privately to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage. To whom not even for an hour did we yield by submission; that the truth of the Gospel might remain with you.*

Moreover, from those reputed to be something——what kind of men they formerly were, makes no difference to me: a man's appearance God does not accept: for to me those in repute proposed nothing: but, on the contrary, having seen that I am entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, according as Peter with that *of the circumcision, (for He who wrought for Peter for apostleship of the circumcision wrought also for me for the Gentiles,) and having known the grace given to me, James and Cephas and John, the* men *reputed to be pillars, gave* their *right hands to me and Barnabas,* right hands *of fellowship, that we* should be *for the Gentiles, but they for the circumcision. Only that the poor we should remember, which very thing I have also been eager to do.*

Paul's independence of the earlier apostles, proved in §§ 5, 6, by the slightness of his intercourse with them in the years following his conversion, he now further proves by his formal intercourse with them on a later visit to Jerusalem. Of this visit, he describes (*v.* 2) the occasion and purpose; and the reception then given (*vv.* 3—5) to Titus, and (*vv.* 6—10) to himself.

1. *Then:* a fourth stage in the narrative, following those similarly introduced in ch. i. 18, 21. *Fourteen years:* reckoned probably from the just-mentioned visit to Jerusalem, which visit is recalled by the word *again*. To this simple exposition there

is no chronological objection. See Diss. i. 7; and 3, where I hope to show that this journey may be confidently identified with that in Acts xv. 4. *With Barnabas:* as recorded in Acts xv. 2: see note under Gal. ii. 21. *Along with me;* seems to reveal Paul's consciousness that in this mission he took the chief part, and thus accords with the order of names in Acts xv. 2, where compare 'certain others with them.' Of Paul's companions, *Barnabas* and *Titus*, and they only, are mentioned, in view of the incidents recorded in *vv.* 3, 9, 13. *Also Titus:* as well as *Barnabas:* see note under 2 Cor. ix. 5.

2. Occasion and purpose of this journey. *According to revelation:* in agreement with, and therefore prompted by supernatural light from God, either in a vision or in some other mode unknown to us. Cp. 2 Cor. xii. 1ff. This was the inner and real, as Acts xv. 2 states the outer and formal occasion of Paul's visit to Jerusalem. Similarly, Peter went to Cæsarea (Acts x. 20) both by request of Cornelius and by Divine revelation. We can well conceive that amid the disputes at Antioch Paul sought counsel from God, and received a special reply which moved him to undertake the journey. This revelation, guiding Paul's movements, attests his peculiar and independent relation to God.

Set before (or *presented to*) *them:* for their judgment. Similar word in *v.* 6, i. 16: the same word in Acts xxv. 14. *To them:* indefinite, followed by the more exact statement, *to those in repute.* The looser statement was perhaps prompted by the thought that what Paul said to the leaders at Jerusalem he said through them to the whole Church. *The Gospel which, etc.:* the matter of his preaching in heathen countries. *Privately, however:* manner in which Paul presented his Gospel to the Christians at Jerusalem, viz. not in a public gathering but in a private interview, and not to the whole Church but to some of its members whom all esteemed. *Those in repute: v.* 6. There is no hint here that Paul presented his Gospel afterwards to the whole Church. Had he meant this, he would have said it. His words here are easily harmonised with Acts xv. 12 by supposing that, before the public assembly met, Paul stated his principles privately to the leaders of the Church, and that in the assembly he merely narrated the facts of his missionary journey, leaving the exposition of Gospel principles to the earlier apostles. Possibly, to this preliminary interview was due the harmony of the assembly. See Diss. i. 3.

Lest . . . in vain: purpose, not only of the subordinate detail

of manner, viz. *privately, to those in repute*, but of the more important general statement *I presented to them the Gospel. In any way;* suggests (cp. 1 Cor. ix. 27) Paul's careful foresight of all contingencies. *Be running:* 1 Cor. ix. 26, Phil. ii. 16: i.e. along the apostolic course marked out for him by God, with all speed, and for a prize. In order that his present strenuous efforts and those of the past seventeen years, may not be *in vain*, Paul expounded to the Church at Jerusalem his teaching *among the Gentiles*.

Paul's purpose implies that upon the approval of his teaching by the other apostles depended the permanent success of his past and present labours. And this, after the lapse of so many centuries, and without having received as yet any hint of the nature of the point in dispute, we can in some measure understand. Had there been essential diversity of teaching between Paul and the earlier apostles, Christianity would have perished in its cradle. For, the sole and sufficient proof that the Gospel as preached in the early Church was actually taught by Christ, was the unanimous testimony of the leaders of the Church. Had Paul's Jewish opponents in Jerusalem (Acts xv. 5) or Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 4) or Galatia (Gal. i. 7) been able successfully to appeal from him to Peter, their appeal would have been irresistible; and would either have discredited his teaching or have created most serious doubt as to what was the actual teaching of Christ. Such doubt would have rendered impossible the firm faith needful to inspire heroic Christian life capable of making head against the corruptions, and the tremendous hostility, of the world around. Therefore, in order that the Church might survive the storms which threatened its life, it was all-important that, by an unmistakable and formal declaration, such appeal to the earlier apostles should be rendered impossible. Discord between them and Paul would have shaken the faith of his converts, and have prevented the erection of a Church capable of enduring to the end of time. It would thus have made vain his past labours, and have blighted the hopes which were the inspiration of his life.

The foregoing exposition implies that the point in dispute was vital. For, difference of opinion about a mere detail would not have been serious. And Paul's calm resolution to maintain to the letter his own teaching, in spite of the felt importance of harmony, proves the infinite importance of the matter in debate. This explains in some measure the tremendous condemnation in ch. i. 8f. And it raises to the highest degree our eagerness to

know the point at issue. For we feel instinctively that a matter of such transcendent importance then must pertain to all time and to all men. It will gradually transpire as we follow the argument of the Epistle.

The purpose here stated does not necessarily imply any real fear about the result of this interview. Paul merely tells us the means he took to guard against what would otherwise have been a serious danger. Doubtless, he knew well that, whatever some other members of the Church at Jerusalem might say, the apostles would support him.

Notice that Paul's acknowledgment that his own permanent success depended on his colleagues' approval of his teaching was the strongest denial he could give to the insinuation that his teaching differed from theirs. His wish to work in harmony with the earlier apostles is attested by his visits, at some peril, to Jerusalem.

[The interpretation of the last words of *v.* 2 is open to some doubt. The indicative ἔδραμον suggests that also τρέχω is indicative; and that μή introduces, not a negative purpose as expounded above, but an indirect question. Cp. 1 Thess. iii. 5. If so, Paul asks whether his present or past labours were in vain. This would be practically an appeal to his success in proof of the divine authority of his teaching. And against the exposition adopted above it is objected that an aorist indicative cannot express a purpose. On the other hand, the construction just suggested is most unusual if not unparalleled; whereas μή introducing a negative purpose is very common. Moreover, in an appeal to the success of his work, Paul would have spoken first of his past efforts, 'whether I have run or am running in vain:' or, rather, he would have spoken only of the past. For the results of his present efforts could not yet be tested. But here his present efforts are mentioned first. And, again, it is very doubtful whether Paul's success among the Gentiles was sufficiently evident to his fellow-apostles to be the ground of an important argument about the truth of his teaching. It is much easier to suppose (with AV. and RV.) that τρέχω is subjunctive, noting a negative purpose; and that ἢ ἔδραμον is an afterthought, modifying somewhat the earlier construction. At the time of his journey to Jerusalem Paul was in the midst of Gospel effort. He remembers that the permanence of the Church, and therefore the abiding success of his present efforts, depend upon the harmony of the apostles. He remembers also his long course of past

effort. And, since this past effort is now matter of fact, its results only being still contingent, he speaks of it in the aorist indicative. In this he is justified by its use after μή when (e.g. iv. 10) expressing fear: for in a negative purpose the idea of fear is always present.]

3—10. Result of Paul's taking Titus to Jerusalem and presenting his Gospel to the christians there: viz. that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised, *vv.* 3—5: and that the teaching of Paul and Barnabas was cordially approved by the leaders of the Church, *vv.* 6—10.

3. *But*, or *nevertheless*: although I took with me Titus, and presented the whole matter of my preaching, *nevertheless, etc. Not even Titus*: as one very likely to be *compelled to be circumcised*. This is explained by the words (cp. i. 2, Acts xv. 25) *who* was *with me*. Even though other Gentile Christians were allowed to remain uncircumcised, yet the official position of *Titus*, as representative to Jerusalem along with Paul of the Church at Antioch, might have been urged as a reason why he should pay respect to the ancient Covenant of God with Israel by submitting to circumcision. That this was not required from Titus, is clear proof that the Church at Jerusalem did not consider circumcision needful for the highest Christian privileges. *Greek*: see under Rom. i. 14. *He being a Greek*: and thus uncircumcised. This guards against the inference that the Christians at Jerusalem would have tolerated (cp. Acts xxi. 21, and xvi. 3) an uncircumcised descendant of Abraham. *Was not compelled to be circumcised*; suggests that there was pressure, in remarkable accord with Acts xv. 5; but states that the pressure was not effective.

4. Reason why 'Titus was not compelled to be circumcised'; or rather a reason of something therein implied, and stated plainly in *v.* 5, viz. that Paul and others strenuously resisted the pressure to have Titus circumcised. In ordinary circumstances the circumcision of a Gentile convert, at the request of Jewish Christians with whom he was associated, would have been less important. But at Jerusalem were men who had intruded themselves into the Church in order to rob the Gospel of its distinctive features and thus (i. 7) overturn it, and who with this in view demanded as obligatory the circumcision of Titus. Paul here says that their demand prevented his circumcision. For it would have been an admission that the rite was still binding.

The privately-brought-in false-brethren: enemies of the Gospel, who by concealing their real opinions and pretending

faith in Christ had crept into the Church at Jerusalem. In 2 Cor. xi. 13 we find similar men at Corinth. *Privately . . . privately:* suggested rather than expressed by the first syllable of the Greek words here used. The suggestion is strengthened by the repetition, and by the word *spy-out*. Same compound words in 2 Pet. ii. 1, Rom. v. 20: cp. Jude 4, 2 Pet. i. 5. This secrecy implies that these men were a small minority of the Church at Jerusalem; and that the majority did not share or know, and would not have tolerated, their views. Else, the secrecy were needless. Consequently, these words are an indirect and courteous recognition by Paul of the soundness of their faith. *False-brethren:* Christians only in pretence. Cp. 2 Cor. xi. 26, Acts xiii. 6, Mt. xxiv. 24, 2 Cor. xi. 13. Contrast the weak brethren in 1 Cor. viii. 11f. It would be unfair to assume that these false brethren were the Pharisees mentioned in Acts xv. 5: for these last are called actual believers. But the presence in the Church of converted Pharisees who had not cast off completely the prejudices of their early training would make more easy the entrance of the false brethren. Hence these passages confirm each other. *To-spy-out:* same word in 2 Sam. x. 3; similar words in Heb. xi. 31, Josh. ii. 1—3: definite purpose of these men when entering the Church. They wished to learn all they could about Christianity in order to pervert it. *Our freedom:* from the Mosaic Law of works, which they wished to reimpose. And this involves freedom from sin and from every humiliating restraint: cp. 1 Cor. vii. 22, ix. 19, Jno. viii. 32. *Which we have, etc.;* expounds and dwells upon the word *our*. This freedom is *in Christ:* i.e. objectively, through the historical facts of His death and resurrection; and subjectively in virtue of, and in proportion to, our spiritual union with Him. Thus Paul, as his wont is, anticipates iv. 26, v. 1, 13. *Our . . . we . . . us:* all Christians, specially including those at Jerusalem into whose midst the false brethren crept, and with whom Paul here associates himself as sharer of the same freedom. This is another acknowledgment of the spiritual life of the Jewish christians. In *v.* 5, the Gentile Christians are specially referred to. *Us:* emphatic, the mass of the christians at Jerusalem, in contrast to the secret intruders. *Bring-into-bondage:* a very strong word: 'they crept into our midst in order that they might crush us down into slavery.'

These words are the first indication of the error disseminated by the disturbers in Galatia. For, only by supposing that they asserted the universal necessity of circumcision can we account

for the mention of the rite here. That our supposition is correct, is placed beyond doubt by ch. v. 2, vi. 12; and by the whole argument of DIV. II. which reveals the spiritual consequences of this demand. We therefore infer with certainty that *v.* 4 would recall to Paul's readers men in their midst essentially the same as those here described. Against both classes of false teachers, the curse of i. 8f was valid. And their deceitfulness (cp. iv. 17, vi. 12) helps us to understand it.

5. *We did not yield;* implies that, through the resistance of Paul and others, the pressure put on Titus failed. Who these others were, we are left to infer. But the secrecy needed for the entrance of the false brethren, and the full accord with Paul of the leaders at Jerusalem, suggest that these last were included, as were probably other members of the Church there. *Not even for an hour:* emphatic. It implies that the demand was made at a definite time; and therefore more or less formally. It was at once resisted. *By submission:* suggested by 'bring-into-bondage.' To have yielded the circumcision of Titus, would have been to bow to the yoke which the secret foes sought to impose. A close coincidence with Acts xv. 10. *The truth of the Gospel:* Col. i. 5: the correspondence with reality which belongs to the good news. The teaching of the false brethren was at variance with reality. For, under the Gospel, circumcision is not actually a condition of the favour of God. *Might continue;* suggests that the Galatians were in danger of losing the truth they already possessed. *With you:* in contrast to *we did not yield.* Paul fought the battle of the Gentile christians. This implies that the continuance of the spiritual life of Paul's converts, which needed the truth for its nourishment, was at stake in his resistance to the demand that Titus be circumcised. Consequently, his resistance to this demand had the same purpose as his exposition (*v.* 2) of the Gospel he preached among the Gentiles. Hence the explanation under *v.* 2 is equally valid here. Moreover in DIV. II. we shall learn that this demand for the circumcision of Gentile converts involved an obligation (v. 3) to keep the whole Law, and thus made of no effect (iii. 10) the Gospel promise and (ii. 21) the death of Christ. Thus by matters far from Galatia Paul is preparing a way for an argument affecting most closely the spiritual interests of the Galatian christians.

Dr. Lightfoot suggests that *v.* 4 begins a new unfinished sentence; and that Paul was going on to say that because of the

false brethren James and Peter counselled that Titus be circumcised, but that he hesitated to say this, and broke off the sentence, merely adding in *v.* 5 that he resisted the demand made. But we have no right even to suggest a difference of opinion between Paul and the other apostles without some sort of proof: and of such difference of opinion we have here no trace. Moreover, when an essential part of a sentence is broken off, we expect to find its sense reappearing in another form. But of this supposed counsel we have in the following verses not the faintest hint. In *vv.* 6—10, the concord of the earlier apostles with Paul is as complete and unhesitating as in the contemporary speeches recorded in Acts xv. 6—21. Nor can Peter's conduct at Antioch (*v.* 11) be accepted as an indication of his advice at Jerusalem. The reason given in *v.* 4 can be no other than a reason for the great decisive fact stated in *v.* 3 and again in *v.* 5, viz. that through the resistance of Paul and others Titus was not compelled to be circumcised. [Had the word δέ been absent, there would be no question about the relation of *v.* 4 to *v.* 3. Its insertion merely gives independent importance to the reason thus introduced: cp. Rom. iii. 22, ix. 30, Phil. ii. 8. So AV. and RV.]

In *v.* 5, the words *to whom not even* are omitted, reversing the sense, in the Clermont MS., both Greek and Latin. Tertullian (*Against Marcion* bk. v. 3) charges Marcion with having wrongly inserted the negative. Some other Latin writers accept, or refer to, this omission. And in the existing Latin translation of Irenæus (bk. iii. 13. 3) the passage is quoted without these words: but the context leaves us in doubt whether they were actually omitted by him. The omission is confined to Latin copies. This places their genuineness beyond doubt. And it is confirmed by internal evidence. For, had Paul yielded, he would not have added the humiliating words *by submission*. Nor can we see how his submission would have secured the permanence of Gospel truth among his readers. This is an interesting example of a very early, and rather serious, error in some copies of the New Testament.

The suggestion of Dr. Farrar (*St. Paul* vol. i. p. 413) that Titus was actually circumcised, and that Paul merely declares that this was not by compulsion and was no act of submission, has no support in the Epistle; and is contradicted by the prominent position of the negatives in *vv.* 3 and 5 which evidently rule the entire assertions, whereas this suggestion would require them to be closely associated with the words 'compelled' and

submission. Moreover it is difficult to see how the circumcision of Titus, when once demanded, could be other than submission to compulsion.

On the apparent inconsistency of Gal. ii. 3, 5 with Acts xvi. 3, see Diss. i. 5.

6—10. Result of Paul's presentation (*v.* 2) of his Gospel at Jerusalem 'to those in repute.' The connection is noted by the recurrence of these last words in *v.* 6 twice and in *v.* 9.

Those reputed to be something: certain men (names given in *v.* 9) rightly or wrongly supposed to have special worth or special authority, of whatever kind and from whatever source: a rather fuller phrase than 'those in repute' in *v.* 2.

What sort of men . . . God does not accept: a parenthesis breaking off the construction. After speaking of what they were *reputed to be*, Paul interposes a few words about *what they* actually *were*. Even this is *nothing* to him: for it is nothing to *God*. *A man's appearance*, or *face*, *God does not accept*, or *respect:* His estimate and treatment of men is not determined by externals. Same teaching and almost same words in Rom. ii. 11. The order of the Greek words suggests the incongruity of *appearances* being taken into account by *God*. These last words imply that *what sort of men they were* refers to something merely external. The easiest explanation is that Paul thinks of their former relation to Christ on earth. For, that Peter and John were His chosen and intimate companions and that James was a member of His own family, would naturally give them great *repute* in the Church at Jerusalem. But this relation to Christ belonged only to externals. It therefore placed them neither higher nor lower in the sight of God; and had no bearing on the independent authority which Paul had received from the Risen Saviour. These words, unexpectedly interposed, suggest, as do ch. i. 1, 11, that the disturbers had insinuated that Paul's authority was inferior to that of the earlier apostles who had been personally associated with Jesus. He interrupts his argument to remind us that the difference between him and them was only external, and therefore of no weight with God.

If the above exposition be correct, the best rendering will be *what they once were* as in RV. margin, or more literally *what sort of men they were formerly;* not *whatsoever they were*, AV., and RV. text. [For, the word *ποτε* which in the N.T. nowhere else means *ever* but frequently (e.g. i. 13, 23 twice) *formerly*, would at once suggest a reference to days gone by.]

Instead of continuing and completing the sentence interrupted by the parenthesis, e.g. '*from those reputed to be something . . .* I received nothing,' Paul abandons it and begins a new sentence. He does so in order to weave his parenthesis into his main argument, as a general principle exemplified in his main assertion which follows it: *for to me, etc. Those in repute* takes up the thread broken off at *those reputed to be something*. Such broken construction is common in Greek: cp. Rom. v. 12. *Proposed nothing:* literally *presented nothing to me* or *set nothing before me:* similar word in *v.* 2, same word in i. 16. *To me:* very emphatic. Paul set before the men in repute at Jerusalem the Gospel he preaches among the Gentiles: but before him they set nothing, i.e. they had no correction or addition to make. This proves that their earlier relation to Christ was nothing to Paul, and illustrates the general principle that externals avail not with God. They evidently knew no more about the Gospel than he did. And, that the earlier apostles had nothing to add to, or correct in, Paul's exposition of his Gospel, proves both his independence of them and their complete accord with him.

7. *But on the contrary:* conduct the opposite of proposing anything to Paul. They merely acknowledged him as a fellow-worker. *Having seen that, etc.:* inward motive of their action. *Having seen . . .* 'and having known' (*v.* 9) are in apposition with' 'James and Cephas and John,' which last expression is parallel to 'those in repute' in *v.* 6. *Entrusted-with:* same word and thought in 1 Tim. i. 11, Tit. i. 3, 1 Thess. ii. 4, 1 Cor. ix. 17, Rom. iii. 2. [Contrast the perfect tense here, noting permanence, with the aorist in Rom. iii. 2.] *Uncircumcision:* see under Rom. ii. 26. *Gospel of the uncircumcision, of the circumcision:* difference of destination only. Cp. 'apostleship of circumcision' in *v.* 8. Of any other difference, we have no hint: and all such is denied in *v.* 8. Moreover, God will treat (Rom. iii. 30) Jew and Gentile alike: and, since the Gospel announces His merciful treatment of men, it must in essence be the same to all. Consequently, the difference is only in the aim of the mission of Peter and of Paul.

8. A parenthesis explaining the phrase 'Gospel of the uncircumcision.' *He that wrought:* cp. Col. i. 29: God the Father, the Source of whatever power for good operates in men. So 1 Cor. xii. 6, Eph. i. 11, 20, Phil. ii. 13. But God operates always through the instrumentality of (1 Thess. ii. 13) His word and (Eph. iii. 20) power and through the agency (1 Cor. xii. 4) of

the Holy Spirit. *Wrought:* literally *inwrought:* an inward activity, and putting forth of power, of God in men. It is the Greek original of the English word 'energy.' A close parallel in Eph. iii. 7. *For Peter:* not 'in Peter,' which is already implied (cp. Col. i. 29) in the verb. The usefulness and consequent enrichment and honour of Peter were an aim of God's work in him. And with similar aim God wrought also for Paul.

This verse implies that only inward divine energy can fit a man to discharge a divine commission.

9. *And having known, etc.;* continues and completes, in strict grammatical sequence, the sentence interrupted by the parenthesis of *v.* 8. Thus this parenthesis differs from that in *v.* 6. 'Having seen' in *v.* 7, denoting mental apprehension of a fact, forms with *having known*, comprehension of the significance of a fact, a climax. *The grace given to me:* God's undeserved favour revealed in the committal to Paul of the Gospel of the uncircumcision and in the corresponding divine energy at work in him. Same words and same thought in Eph. iii. 2, 7, 8, iv. 7. That *James* is put before *Cephas* and *John*, who were disciples of Christ long before he was, implies that in the Church at Jerusalem he held a place in some respects higher than that of the most prominent of the twelve apostles. It was a courteous recognition of the Church at Jerusalem, of which James was the head, as the Mother-Church of Christendom. See note at end of DIV. I. *Reputed to be pillars;* both completes the idea partly conveyed by the word *reputed* in *vv.* 2, 6, and tells us that the men just named are those referred to there. *Pillars:* 1 Tim. iii. 15, Rev. iii. 12. So Ep. of Clement ch. v., 'the greatest and most righteous pillars,' viz. Peter and Paul: see my *Corinthians* App. A. Of the Church, which is God's temple, they were accounted to be conspicuous supports and ornaments. A metaphor common in Jewish, Greek, and Latin writers. *Gave right hands:* cp. 2 Kgs. x. 15, Ezra x. 19, 1 Macc. vi. 58, xi. 62. So Josephus, *Antiq.* bk. xviii. 9. 3, about the Parthians: "He gave his right hand, which is with all the barbarians there the greatest proof of confidence in those talking together." The word *of-fellowship* is delayed, that we may think first of the outward act, viz. the shaking of hands, and then of its significance, viz. recognition that all were comrades. The order of words, *me and Barnabas*, (a remarkable coincidence with Acts xv. 2, 22, 35,) suggests Paul's consciousness that he held the first place; and this agrees with the singular number (*I, me*)

throughout *vv.* 6—9*a*. See under *v.* 1. *Fellowship:* literally 'having something in common with others.' See under 1 Cor. x. 16, Rom. xv. 26. '*James and Cephas and John* recognised *me and Barnabas* as sharers with themselves of the rank and work of apostles.' They did so *in order that*, while working in harmony, each party should devote itself to its divinely (*v.* 8) marked out sphere of labour. *That we* should be *for the Gentiles:* i.e. apostles to the Gentiles.

10. The *only* exception to the wish of James, Peter, and John that Paul and Barnabas should devote themselves to the Gentiles. *The poor:* or *the poor ones*. It implies a poverty so notorious as to make the Jewish poor a definite object of thought. And their mention by James, apparently without any special occasion, suggests that the poverty was abiding. A remarkable coincidence with Acts xi. 28f, Rom. xv. 26. *That we should remember:* assuming that mere remembrance would evoke help. [The subjunctive present notes an abiding remembrance.] This request reveals the deplorable state of Palestine even as compared with surrounding countries.

I have also been eager to do; adds to the request Paul's ready consent and fulfilment. *Eager:* same word as 'earnestness' (RV.) in same connection in 2 Cor. viii. 7, 8. The conspicuous change from *we* to *I* forbids us to limit this expression of eagerness to the promise then made; for in such promise Barnabas would certainly join; and if so Paul could not speak of it in the singular number. His assertion of eagerness covers his own conduct to the time of writing this Epistle: whereas Barnabas left him (Acts xv. 39) soon after their return from Jerusalem to Antioch. [I have therefore correctly rendered the Greek aorist, retaining its absolute indefiniteness, *I have been eager*.] This request may have been recalled to Paul's mind by the great collection for the poor at Jerusalem which he was making while writing these words, and which was a conspicuous proof of their truth. Possibly, on other occasions also he had rendered help.

REVIEW. After proving negatively the independence of the Gospel he preached by the scantiness of his intercourse with the earlier apostles, Paul gives in § 7 further proof of it by narrating their action when he met them at an important crisis in the history of the early Church, fourteen years after the visit mentioned above. This later visit to Jerusalem was undertaken by God's direction: and Paul felt that upon its success hung the highest welfare and indeed the permanence of the Gentile Churches. The

greatness of the issue moved him to present the matters in dispute, not publicly to the whole Church, but privately to its leaders. The chief point objected to in his teaching, viz. that circumcision was not binding on Gentile converts, was conceded, in spite of opposition, in the test case of Titus, a Gentile companion who had gone up with Paul to Jerusalem. And, when Paul expounded his teaching among the Gentiles, the earlier apostles had no correction or addition to suggest, but simply and readily recognised him as a fellow-worker, to whom along with Barnabas God had allotted work different from that allotted to them. They merely begged him, in his work among the Gentiles, not to forget the poverty of his fellow countrymen at home, a request with which during many years Paul had eagerly complied.

This section has revealed a specific, and as we shall see probably the most conspicuous element of the erroneous teaching which in this letter Paul combats, viz. the universal obligation of circumcision. The tremendous spiritual consequences involved in this error, we shall learn in DIV. II. To overturn it by stating and defending the truth of the Gospel, we shall find to be the chief aim of this Epistle.

SECTION VIII.

PAUL'S RESISTANCE TO PETER, AND EXPOSITION OF HIS OWN PRINCIPLES

CH. II. 11—21.

But when Cephas had come to Antioch, to the *face I withstood him, because he was known to be in the wrong.* 12 *For, before there came some men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they came, he began to withdraw and to separate himself, fearing them of* the *circumcision.* 13 *And the rest of the Jews also played the hypocrite with him, so that even Barnabas was led away with their hypocrisy.* 14 *But when I saw that they are not walking rightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas before all, If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles and not as do the Jews, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to act as do the Jews?* 15 *We, by nature Jews and not sinners from* the *Gentiles,* 16 *yet knowing that a man is not justified by works of law but only through belief of*

Jesus Christ, also we believed in Christ Jesus in order that we might be justified by belief of Christ and not by works of law; because "By works of law will no flesh be justified." (Ps. cxliii. 2.) "*Now if, while seeking to be justified in Christ, also ourselves have been found* to be *sinners, are we to infer that Christ is a minister of sin? Far from it.* "*For, if what I pulled down these things again I build up, I present myself as a transgressor.* "*For I through law died to law that I might live for God.* "*With Christ I have been crucified: and it is no longer I that live, but in me Christ lives. And the* life *which I now live in flesh I live in faith,* in belief *of the Son of God who loved me and gave up Himself on my behalf.* "*I do not set aside the grace of God: for if through law* comes *righteousness, then Christ died for nought.*

After proving the independence of his authority as an apostle, from the scantiness of his intercourse with the earlier apostles during the years following his conversion and from the formal recognition accorded to him by them at Jerusalem, Paul now goes on to give a final and conclusive proof of the same from an incident at Antioch in which he actually resisted publicly the chief of the twelve apostles. His words to Peter flow into a description of his own spiritual life, a description which is a reply both to Peter and to the disturbers in Galatia.

11. Another step (cp. i. 15) in the historical narrative. *Had come:* better than (RV.) *came.* For evidently Peter had been some time at Antioch, and after him others had arrived, before Paul rebuked him. [For this correct use of the aorist where we use the pluperfect, cp. Acts xxi. 26, i. 2. The action is looked upon merely as having occurred at some indefinite past time:] *Cephas . . . to Antioch:* a coincidence with Acts xv. 35, where both Paul and Barnabas are said to have remained some time at Antioch after their return from the conference at Jerusalem. The scantiness of the narrative of the Book of Acts forbids all surprise that this incident is not recorded there. *To* the *face I withstood him:* graphic picture. *Known to be in the wrong:* same word in 1 Jno. iii. 20f. It denotes, not spoken condemnation, but mental recognition of his guilt by those around; thus differing from the word in Rom. xiv. 23. That Peter was known to have done wrong, moved Paul to reprove him publicly. Otherwise the rebuke might have been private.

12, 13. The just-mentioned misconduct of Peter, and its effect

upon others. *Came . . . from James:* probably to be taken together. For such a phrase as *they from James* (cp. Acts vi. 9) is not found in the New Testament: and it is not likely that Paul would speak of any men as disciples of James. Cp. Mk. v. 35, 1 Thess. iii. 6; which also forbid us to infer that these men were sent by James. But, that his name is used in this semi-local sense, reveals his influence in the Church at Jerusalem, to which these men evidently belonged. And this professed relation to James suggests that he was in less marked antagonism to them than was Paul. That these were 'false brethren,' we have no proof. For those in *v.* 4 were only a secret minority of the Church at Jerusalem. But evidently (cp. Acts xi. 3, xv. 5) these men held the restrictions of the Mosaic Law to be still binding. *He used to eat-with the Gentiles:* as the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem complained that he did with Cornelius, in opposition to the practice of (Lk. xv. 2) the Pharisees and Scribes. The vision of Peter (Acts x. 28) implies that this refusal to eat with the Gentiles arose from fear of eating food forbidden (Lev. xi. 2ff) in the Law. If so, by eating with Cornelius and with the Gentiles at Antioch, Peter acknowledged virtually that the Law of Moses was no longer binding even upon Jews; in direct opposition to the converted Pharisees (Acts xv. 5) at Jerusalem. He thus went rather further than the Decree, which (*v.* 24) merely refused to make the Law binding on Gentiles but said nothing about Jewish Christians. But he did so in obedience to a revelation (Acts x. 15) from God.

Drew-back: same word in Acts xx. 20, 27, from the lips of Paul. It suggests a quiet and timid retirement leading to separation. *Them of* (or *from*) the *circumcision:* Rom. iv. 12, (cp. *v.* 14,) Acts x. 45, xi. 2: converts from Judaism. Yet not all the converted Jews at Antioch. For in *v.* 13 'other Jews' imitated Peter's example; and therefore could hardly be objects of *fear* to him. Probably Paul refers chiefly to the new comers from Jerusalem; and perhaps to others whose zeal for the Law was rekindled by their arrival. They were men whose religious life bore conspicuously the mark of their origin. *Separated himself:* from the society and from the tables of the Gentile christians; who evidently did not observe the Mosaic distinctions of food. We have here a genuine trait of Peter's character, viz. a proneness to yield, for good or ill, to the latest influence from without. Probably the influence of Paul's exposition of his principles (*v.* 2) prompted the speech recorded in Acts xv. 7ff:

the influence of these new arrivals now prompts conduct quite inconsistent with that speech. See note below.

13. Continues the narrative by adding the result of Peter's conduct. *Hypocrite:* an English form of the Greek word for an actor in a theatre; then in the N.T. for one who pretends to be what he is not. The denunciations of Christ (Mt. vi. 2, 5, 16, etc.) gave to the word a tremendous significance. Cp. 2 Macc. vi. 21, 24, 25. *Played-the-hypocrite-with him:* in the unreal part Peter was acting, *the rest of the* Christian *Jews* at Antioch joined him. This implies that formerly they had eaten with the Gentiles; and that now, while acting as though the Mosaic restrictions were still obligatory, they knew that the obligation had passed away. All this agrees with Acts xv. 31. Paul thus claims both Peter and the Jewish Christians at Antioch as in their hearts agreeing with that which in this Epistle he so earnestly advocates. The word *Jews* recalls the powerful influence of nationality; especially of visitors from the capital on fellow-countrymen living in a foreign land.

Even Barnabas: as though unlikely to be influenced by such an example: a courteous recognition of his superiority to those around him. And, that even he *was led away*, (same word in 2 Pet. iii. 17,) proves the strength of the influence which bore him along. *With their hypocrisy:* the repetition lays great stress on the unreality of their action. Notice the different relation of Peter and Barnabas to this movement. Apparently without any outward pressure, Peter yielded at once to the silent influence of the arrivals from Jerusalem. His powerful example, as the foremost of the twelve apostles, carried along the whole body of the Jewish Christians at Antioch. And to this accumulated influence Barnabas yielded. He could not stand alone. But he was moved by the mass: Peter moved the mass.

14. Paul's view of the conduct just narrated; and his rebuke of Peter. [Ἀλλ' ὅτε introduces a contrast.] He thus expounds (*v.* 11) 'to the face I withstood him'; as in *vv.* 12, 13 he expounded 'he was known to be in the wrong.' *Walking aright:* along a straight road. *The truth of the Gospel:* as in *v.* 5. The Gospel corresponds with, and reveals, eternal realities. And this revealed reality is a straight line along which God designs us to go. *Before all:* for his bad example had been felt by all, and therefore needed public rebuke. *As do the Gentiles:* literally, *in-Gentile-fashion and not in-Jewish-fashion:* two modes of life placed side by side in marked contrast. Paul refers

evidently to the Mosaic restrictions of animal food; the most conspicuous distinction between Jews and Gentiles, and evidently designed by God to be such. Rather than break through these restrictions, many Jews had preferred to die: 1 Macc. i. 63, 2 Macc. vi. 18f, vii. 1. In complete contrast to these traditions of martyrdom for the Jewish Law, was Peter's conduct at Antioch before the men 'came from James.' *How*, or *how is it that thou:* iv. 9, Rom. vi. 2, viii. 32, 1 Cor. xv. 12. So remarkable, because so inconsistent, was Peter's action that Paul asks *how* it comes about. *To-act-as-do-the-Jews:* literally *to Judaize:* cognate to *in-Jewish-fashion*, and 'Judaism' in i. 13, 14. Cp. Esther viii. 17, 'many Gentiles were having themselves circumcised and were Judaizing because of the fear of the Jews'; Plutarch, *Cicero* § 7, "guilty of Judaizing." It embraces whatever habits of life distinguished the Jews from other nations. By separating himself from the Gentile Christians, Peter virtually taught with apostolic authority that for the full enjoyment of the favour and covenant of God Jewish customs must be observed. And by so doing he was practically forcing the Gentile converts to live under Jewish restrictions. *Compel:* the real, though undesigned, significance and tendency of Peter's action; according to the usual sense of the Greek present, which does not indicate whether or not the influence so exerted was effectual. Cp. 2 Macc. vi. 18, "Eleazar was being compelled to eat pork;" although he refused to eat it: so ch. vii. 1.

Peter's previous conduct, which agreed with his convictions, Paul assumes to be his normal conduct; and therefore speaks of it in the present tense, describing it for emphasis both positively and negatively. With this he contrasts the practical tendency of Peter's later conduct. By his authoritative example he was compelling Gentiles to maintain Jewish distinctions which he, a born Jew, had systematically trampled under foot. The exposure of this inconsistency before the Christians at Antioch, who knew that Paul's words were true, is his first argument against Peter, to whom it must have come with overwhelming force. And with equal force it bore upon the Churches in Galatia. For this question implies that both Peter and the Church at Antioch, in spite of their contrary action, agreed with Paul's teaching, viz. that Mosaic restrictions are no longer binding.

15, 16. A second appeal, based on the spiritual experience of Paul and Peter, against the teaching implied in Peter's inconsistent conduct. It is suggested by the foregoing rebuke.

We: Paul and Peter, in contrast to the Gentiles whom Peter was compelling to live like Jews. *By-nature:* by birth, and apart from their own action; in contrast to proselytes who became Jews by choice. See under Rom. ii. 14. *By-nature Jews:* parallel with, but more definite than, 'being a Jew' in *v.* 14. *And not, etc.:* emphatic contrast, as in *v.* 14. *From Gentiles:* i.e. converts from heathenism. *Sinners:* necessary result of heathen origin, as all Jews would readily admit: for heathenism cannot save from sin. It was a common Jewish designation of Gentiles. So 1 Macc. ii. 44, "they smote sinners in their anger and lawless men in their fury;" Tobit. xiii. 6, "His greatness to a nation of sinners;" Wisdom x. 20, referring to the Egyptians in the Red Sea: cp. Lk. vi. 32f with Mt. v. 47; Mt. xxvi. 45 with Lk. xviii. 32. For the sake of the contrast which follows Paul assumes the point of view of Jewish self-righteousness, a point of view actually correct in this one particular. For, like all men, the Gentiles were sinners.

But knowing, etc.: in apposition with *we*, and continuing by a slight contrast the description begun in *by-nature Jews*. 'Although born Jews and not inheritors of the pollution of heathendom, yet we know that a man does not receive justification from works of law. *A man is-justified:* as from day to day one and another receive justification. *Law:* any rule of conduct. Jews would think only of the Mosaic Law. *Works of law:* cp. Rom. ii. 15: actions prescribed in a rule of conduct. From such actions no one derives righteousness: i.e. no one is accepted by God as righteous because he has done what some law bids. See an instructive parallel in Rom. iii. 28. Naturally Paul thinks of actions prescribed in the Law of Moses; actions moral or ritual, both which are prescribed in the same Law and closely interwoven. But his words in their full latitude exclude justification by anything done in obedience to a rule of conduct. If there be justification, it must be 'apart from works of law.'

But only (literally *except*, or *if not*) *by works of law;* suggests at first sight that only by faith are we *justified by works of law* But this inference is not supported by Greek usage. For, inasmuch as exceptions are usually preceded by a universal assertion, positive or negative, the exception is, even when preceded by a limited assertion, sometimes taken, not to the entire assertion, but to a wider term contained in it. So Lk. iv. 26f, 'many lepers in Israel . . . but not one of them was cleansed except Naaman the Syrian': i.e. no leper was cleansed except Naaman. So in

Rom. xiv. 14 an exception is taken, not to the statement 'nothing is common of itself,' but simply to a wider assertion 'nothing is common.' So Rev. xxi. 27: 'there shall not enter into it anything common . . . except they that are written, etc.' And that here *except through faith* limits, not *justified by works of law*, but the wider statement *is not justified*, is made quite certain by the clear statements in iii. 11, 'in law no one is justified'; in Rom. iii. 28, 'a man is justified by faith apart from works of law.' Paul merely says in the strongest way possible that *a man is not justified except through faith. Faith*, or *belief, of Jesus Christ*: assurance that His words are true or will come true, as the case may be: see note under Rom. iv. 25.

Also we; takes up the word *we* in *v.* 15 and puts it in conspicuous prominence on the pedestal erected for it by the intervening words. Then follows the chief assertion of the sentence occupying *vv.* 15, 16. This is better (so AV. and RV.) than to begin a new sentence here. For, the foregoing words, which have great force as a preparation for those following, have not sufficient independent weight to be a separate sentence. *Also*, or *even we:* in addition to the *sinners from the Gentiles;* in spite of being born Jews, and prompted by our knowledge that justification comes only through faith. *Believed in Christ:* with Paul, only Rom. x. 14, Phil. i. 29, Col. ii. 5, 1 Tim. iii. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 15: very common in the 4th Gospel. See note under Rom. iv. 25. It denotes a confidence in Christ which assures us that He will fulfil His promises. *We believed:* when we first put faith in Christ: so Rom. xiii. 11. *In order that we might be justified, etc.:* definite purpose with which we believed in Christ. On this purpose rests the weight of the argument. It is made very conspicuous by the repeated contrast, before and after, between belief of Christ, whose name is mentioned three times, and *works of law*. Over this contrast, Paul seems to linger. He declares emphatically that both he and Peter reposed faith in Christ because of the felt impossibility of gaining justification by works of law. [For *οὐ* in a final sentence, cp. 1 Cor. i. 17. Paul says categorically that while seeking justification he was not seeking it from works of law.]

Because from works, etc.: reason why Paul sought justification by faith and not by actions prescribed in a rule of conduct, or rather the reason already given repeated in epigrammatical form, viz. because from that source justification will never come.

No flesh: see under Rom. iii. 20. The Hebrew colouring of this conclusion, and its word for word agreement with Rom. iii. 20, which is evidently a quotation from Ps. cxliii. 2, prove that it is also a reference to the same. Paul's words are thus supported by Old Testament authority. Indeed otherwise they would be empty repetition. Their exact agreement with Rom. iii. 20, even where they differ from the LXX., suggests that this quotation was frequent in the lips of Paul: and its appropriateness makes this very likely.

Verses 15, 16 give the inner side of the spiritual history of Peter and Paul. And they by no means contradict what we know of its outer side. We cannot doubt that Peter, before Andrew 'led him to Jesus,' and Paul, before he went to Damascus, had like thousands since sought the favour of God by obedience to law, i.e. by morality or by religious duties; and that the failure of their search had taught them that not thus can it be obtained. Indeed without this preparation the words of Jesus to Peter and afterwards to Paul would have been ineffective. Until we find that morality cannot save us, we cannot trust for salvation to the word of Christ. Consequently, these words are true of all who venture to repose faith in Christ. And they were a powerful appeal to Peter's remembrance of his own inner life. For he was now practically setting up as a condition, and in this sense as a means, of salvation that which, when he first came to Christ, he had forsaken because he had found that from it salvation could not be obtained. Paul says: 'Take the case of you and me. Although we were born Jews and not the offspring of idolaters and sharers of the awful immorality of heathenism, yet, inasmuch as we found by experience that no justification comes from works done in obedience to law, but only through faith, even we, born Jews and as compared with others moral men, put faith in Christ in order that from faith in Him we might have a justification not to be derived from works of law. And this motive for believing Christ, viz. that from works of law no one clothed in flesh and blood will receive justification, is frequently asserted in the Old Testament. This argument would come to Peter with force the more overwhelming because it is really a reproduction of his own earlier teaching; e.g. Acts xv. 10f, x. 28, 34, xi. 17.

This long and emphatic quotation of Paul's words to Peter assures us that they bear very closely upon the argument of this Epistle. We have thus another indication, in addition to that detected in *v.* 3, of the error then prevalent in Galatia. Evidently,

the disturbers not only demanded that Gentile converts be circumcised, but did so on the ground that obedience to the Mosaic Law was an abiding and universal condition of justification. That this inference is correct, will be placed beyond doubt by the argument of ch. iii.; as our inferences in *v.* 3 about circumcision will be verified by plain assertions in v. 3, vi. 12. Thus this verse prepares the way for the main argument of the Epistle.

17. An incorrect inference from *v.* 16 in the form of a question, suggesting an objection so serious that Paul must at once state and overturn it. It has a close parallel in Rom. vi., where a similar objection is met by a similar argument: cp. *v.* 19 with Rom. vi. 6, 11, vii. 4. *Justified in Christ:* 'in His blood,' Rom. v. 9; 'through the redemption which is in Christ,' iii. 24; 'in law,' Gal. iii. 11, v. 4; 'sanctified in Christ,' 1 Cor. i. 2. Justification was wrought out for us objectively in the historic Person of Christ, and subjectively appropriated by the faith which unites men to Him. *Seeking to be justified, etc.:* implied in the purpose asserted in *v.* 16, viz. 'that we might be justified by belief of Christ.' *We were found*, or *have been found:* [the Greek aorist includes both senses:] cp. 1 Cor. xv. 15, Rom. vii. 10. *Also ourselves sinners:* in addition to the 'sinners from the Gentiles' in *v.* 15. It takes up 'also we' in *v.* 16. The mere search for justification, apart from its success, was itself a discovery that tho seekers, like the Gentiles whom they once despised, were *also themselves sinners*. For only sinners need justification. Consequently, this supposition is a correct inference from *v.* 16. Even Peter and Paul had by their turning to Christ been *found* to be previously *sinners*. Paul now asks whether from this we are to draw the further inference that *Christ is a minister of sin*. Cp. 'ministers of righteousness,' 2 Cor. xi. 15, 'ministry of righteousness,' iii. 9; 'minister of circumcision,' Rom. xv. 8. It is practically the same, but more dignified than 'servant of sin,' Rom. vi. 20. 'Since the Law utterly condemns sin, and since by turning to Christ for justification we were found to be, in spite of our earnest efforts to keep the Law, sinners like other men, are we to infer that Christ is an officer in the service of sin, that His influence tends to extend its empire?' This is, in another form, the ever recurring objection that the Gospel of Christ which reveals the guilt of even the most moral men is opposed to morality. Paul states it here in the form of a question in order that he may overturn it by a picture of his own life of faith.

The above exposition implies that the questioned inference, *Christ a minister of sin*, is incorrectly deduced from a correct hypothesis, *also ourselves found* to be *sinners;* the hypothesis being really a correct inference from *v.* 16. The early Greek commentators suppose the undoubtedly false inference *Christ a minister of sin* to be correctly deduced from, thus disproving by *reductio ad absurdum* the hypothesis *ourselves found* to be *sinners*. If so, *v.* 17 proves that believers are no longer under the penalty of sin, by saying that otherwise Christ in whom they trust for pardon is, by leaving them still under condemnation, doing the work of sin. Paul's question would thus be a proof of the truth of the Gospel which proclaims the justification of all who believe. But this argument would need to be more clearly indicated; especially as *v.* 16 is not so much an assertion of the Gospel as a denial that men are justified by works; whereas, as expounded above, the hypothesis flows naturally from the foregoing assertion.

18. Proof, extending to *v.* 21, of Paul's indignant denial that the discovered sin of even moral seekers for salvation in Christ proves Him to be a minister of sin. *Pulled down, build up:* metaphor common with Paul, Rom. xiv. 19f, xv. 20. By 'eating with the Gentiles' Peter was pulling down the barrier of the Mosaic restrictions: by afterwards withdrawing from them he was building it again. This express and evident reference Paul courteously veils by using the first person as though merely stating a general principle. *These again:* emphatic exposure of Peter's inconsistency. *Transgressor:* one who oversteps the limits marked by law; more precise than 'sinner,' preparing the way for the word 'law' twice in *v.* 19. If by formerly pulling down the restrictions of the Law Peter had, as *v.* 19 will show, been really carrying out the ultimate purpose of the Law, he is now, by maintaining the same restrictions, opposing the Law and transgressing the limits it has marked out for its own operation. His own inconsistency condemns him.

19. Shows the bearing on *v.* 17 of the general and rather ambiguous statement in *v.* 18; and thus introduces the main proof that even though the Gospel brings down all men to the common level of 'sinners' yet Christ is not 'a minister of sin.' *As to me:* the Greek emphatic pronoun, recalling us from the general statement of *v.* 18 to Paul's own actual spiritual life. *I died to law:* expounded in Rom. vii. 4, 'put to death to the Law through the body of Christ.' By His crucified body, Paul was

removed completely from the jurisdiction of law, so that God no longer treats him according to his previous obedience to a rule of conduct as though such obedience were the means of obtaining His favour. This is another way of saying that by the death of Christ God has reconciled the justification of sinners with His own justice. And this escape from the claims of the Law and separation from its rule was brought about *by means of law*. For it was to satisfy these claims that Christ died: and the purpose of the Law was to force men to Christ, and by so doing place them beyond its own jurisdiction. Thus objectively and subjectively Paul's deliverance from the rule of law was brought about by the operation of law. *That I may live for God:* God's purpose in liberating Paul from law. Cp. Rom. vii. 4, 'put to death to the Law . . . that we may bear fruit for God:' vi. 11, 'living for God in Christ Jesus.' This verse embodies in a few words the most distinctive teaching of Paul.

It is now evident that, if by the operation of the Law and in accomplishment of its original purpose Paul has been set free from law and therefore from the Mosaic restrictions, to build up again the barrier erected by these restrictions is to run counter to the spirit and purpose of the Law itself, and is therefore a transgression of the Law. Just so, to re-erect the scaffolding of a finished building is to thwart the original purpose of that scaffolding, which is a building free from scaffulding. Consequently, by separating himself from the Gentile converts at Antioch, Peter was resisting the voice of Sinai: for he was hindering its real and final purpose. Again, since the purpose of this release from law is that we *may live for God*, it is evident that although the Gospel brings down all men to the common level of sinners yet Christ is not thereby promoting the rule of sin. For, to use for God all the powers which life gives, is (cp. Rom. vi. 11) the absolute opposite of sin. All this is made more evident by the description in *v.* 20 of the life which Paul is living.

20. "The summit and marrow of Christianity:" Bengel. *Crucified-with:* same word in Mt. xxvii. 44, Mk. xv. 32, Jno. xix. 32. *With Christ I have been crucified:* Rom. vi. 6, Gal. vi. 14: 'I have shared with Christ the results of His death on the cross.' For by the agony of His crucifixion Paul escaped, as did Christ, from the penalty of sin imposed by the Law. Through the death of Christ, and therefore in some sense upon His cross, Paul's old life came to an end.

The rest of *v.* 20 describes the life which Paul, though crucified,

still lives. Of this life, his own personality is *no longer*, as it once was, the principle and source. He is deeply and gratefully conscious that his own life, both in its essence and its manifestations, is infinitely above himself who lives it; and is a direct outflow (Jno. xiv. 19) of the immortal life of Christ, so that Paul's thoughts and words and acts have their true source not in him but in Christ. Thus Paul lives on earth *in* human *flesh* a life, not earthly but heavenly, not human but divine; a life which is in some sense a continuation of Christ's life on earth.

These words are the highest development of the teaching that in us dwells the Spirit of God who is (Rom. viii. 9ff) the Spirit of Christ and who breathes into those in whom He dwells the life-giving, animating, controlling presence of Christ Himself. This inward presence of the Spirit of Christ makes us (1 Cor. xii. 12) members of the body of Christ. And Paul could say in Phil. i. 21: 'to me to live is Christ.' And if Christ lives in us as the animating principle of our life, we live in Christ as our surrounding element and home and refuge.

Notice that it is the crucified Saviour who lives in those who have shared His crucifixion. Only they whose former lives have come to an end upon the cross of Christ have Christ living in them. For union with Him implies (Rom. vi. 3) union with His death.

Now follows the subjective element and medium and condition of the life which Christ lives in Paul. *I now live:* counterpart to *no longer I live. In flesh:* in a body of flesh and blood, which in virtue of its material constitution influences and limits in so many ways the spirit within. And these limitations give occasion for a revelation in Paul's bodily life of the grandeur of Christ, who in spite of them lives in him a life of constant victory over the flesh. *In flesh, in faith:* conspicuous contrast of the local physiological sphere with the spiritual sphere of Paul's life. *Faith*, or *belief, of the Son of God:* as in *v.* 16 twice: assurance that the words of Jesus are true and will come true; in this case, an assurance that Christ will fulfil His promise by living in us as the animating principle of our life. This assurance is the surrounding element and atmosphere in which Paul lives and moves, and from which he draws his life and through which he sees objects around him on earth and above him in heaven. *Son of God:* Christ in His unique and eternal relation to the Father. *Loved me etc.:* close parallel in Eph. v. 25; cp. Rom. viii. 37. It refers to the historical manifestation in time of Christ's eternal

love. *Gave-up*: to suffering and death, as suggested by *crucified-with Christ*. Cp. i. 4. It denotes frequently surrender into the power of another: cp. 1 Cor. v. 5, 1 Tim. i. 20. Same word also in Rom. iv. 25, viii. 32, 1 Cor. xi. 23, Eph. v. 2, 25.

On my behalf: for my benefit, viz. salvation. In view of the self-surrender of Christ, Paul forgets all others and remembers only that for him Christ died. Cp. 2 Cor. viii. 9. The love of Christ in its historical manifestation is a sure ground of the faith in which Paul lives. Because of His love and self-surrender we are sure that Christ will fulfil His promise to live in us: the faith thus evoked becomes the element of our life: and in proportion to our faith (but not because of it) Christ lives in our life. That such a life is lived *in flesh*, reveals the grandeur of Him who can inspire even flesh and blood with His own spirit.

21. *The grace of God*: cp. 1 Cor. xv. 10. It reminds us that the life just described is a gift of the undeserved favour of God, of the favour revealed in the death of Christ. *Set-aside*: strange contrast to *v.* 20, implying that it is possible to refuse and lose this great gift. It brings *v.* 20, which seemed for a moment to raise us far above all theological controversy into Heaven itself, to bear on the sad reality of the discord at Antioch. *For if etc.*; explains what Paul means by rejecting the grace of God. *Righteousness*: practically, the judge's approval; see under Rom. i. 17. *Through law*: of any kind, moral or ritual. *Righteousness through law*, is the judge's approval obtained by obedience to prescriptions of conduct. God gave Christ to die in order to reconcile with justice favour shown to men who have disobeyed. Consequently, if by obedience men may obtain the favour of God, the death of Christ was needless; and the infinite favour shown therein was wasted. In this sense, to preach justification by law, is to *set aside the grace of God*.

The objection in *v.* 17 is now completely silenced; not by exact syllogism, but by a reasoned exposition of Paul's own spiritual life. It might seem that, by proclaiming a Gospel which reveals the failure of well-meant efforts to obtain the approval of God by keeping the Law, Christ was an enemy of righteousness and a helper of sin. But this thought is dispelled by the fact that Christ lives in Paul and Paul lives in faith and thus lives for God; such a life being, as we at once feel instinctively, the noblest life conceivable. Paul entered this life by sharing in some sense the death of Christ and thus escaping from the jurisdiction of the Law. This escape from law was itself brought about by the

operation of law. Consequently, the real transgressors are, not those who break down the Mosaic restrictions which were not designed to be permanent or universal, but those who run counter to the spirit and purpose of the Law by reinforcing these restrictions after having by their conduct broken them down. Such men trample under foot the favour of God shown in the death of Christ. For, by maintaining the Law as a condition of righteousness they say practically that men are able to keep it; and if so the death of Christ, who died to deliver us from its claims, was needless.

The connecting links of this argument, which we have in some measure supplied in exposition, will be found developed in DIV. II., for which it prepares the way.

The objection in *v.* 17 was probably frequent in the lips of Jewish opponents of Christianity. And the reply to it here given had as much force for the disturbers in Galatia as for Peter at Antioch. So in all ages and places a rich experience of spiritual life is the strongest condemnation of salvation by morality or by religious duties.

It has been questioned whether the whole of *vv.* 14—21 was in substance actually spoken to Peter, or whether Paul glides away imperceptibly into a new argument with his Galatian readers. But, certainly, *we* and *also we* in *vv.* 15, 16 refer, not to the Galatians who were Gentiles, but to Paul and Peter who were Jews. And it is difficult to separate *also ourselves sinners* in *v.* 17 from *sinners* in *v.* 15 and *also we* in *v.* 16. Moreover, *v.* 18 is most easily explained as being a reference to Peter's inconsistent conduct at Antioch. And the appeal in iii. 1 seems to mark the point at which Paul turns to his readers in Galatia. We have, therefore, no reason to doubt that the whole paragraph, to *v.* 21, was in substance spoken by Paul to Peter.

That Peter yielded at once, and fully, to this appeal, we infer with confidence. For, evidently, reply was impossible. His answer, which must have been humiliating, is therefore omitted. This was the more easy because, whatever Peter said, Paul's appeal to him is an overwhelming argument against the disturbers in Galatia. For Peter, to whom they seem to have appealed as an authority superior to Paul, admitted by his conduct that the Law was not binding on Gentiles; thus contradicting them. Moreover, so far was Peter from being an absolute authority that subsequently he acted, influenced by men like-minded to them, in opposition to his previously avowed principles. And Paul's declaration that the powerlessness of the Law to save had driven

both Peter and himself to seek salvation in Christ, was equally true of the advocates of circumcision in Galatia, so far as they were honest men.

OF DIVISION I., the only explanation is that in the churches of Galatia Jewish teachers, either mistaken or feigned disciples of Christ, had said that Paul's authority was inferior to that of the earlier apostles, because derived from them; and that he preached a false Gospel different from that committed to him by the twelve. We also infer that they demanded the circumcision of Gentile converts, as a condition of their justification. These teachers were unfortunately successful: and, led by them, while Paul wrote many Galatian Christians were turning away from the Gospel and from God.

In view of this false teaching which bore on its face marks of human origin, Paul declares that his own teaching is not such as man would devise; and explains this by saying that he received it, not from man, but by express revelation of Christ. Indeed, the contrast between his past and present life proclaims that Christ had been revealed to him and in him. So sufficient was this revelation that Paul sought no human counsel, but went away to Arabia; and even when returning from Arabia he did not go to Jerusalem but came back to Damascus. Only after three years did he visit the Mother-Church of Christianity. Naturally he wished to meet the chief of the earlier apostles: and he saw also James, but no others. This proves that from the apostolic college as such he had received no commission. And the length of his visit, only a fortnight, was insufficient to make Paul in any sense a disciple of Peter or James. For some time after this Paul was known only by hearsay to the Christians of Judæa. But what they heard gave them the highest satisfaction.

The independence of Paul's authority, proved by his distance from the Palestinian apostles, is confirmed by his intercourse with them fourteen years after his first meeting with Peter. The infinite importance of harmony between himself and them, even for the success of his own mission, Paul felt deeply; and, to secure it, he set before the leaders of the church at Jerusalem privately the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles. Of the sentiments of the Christians at Jerusalem, the presence of Titus was a practical test. Although occupying a conspicuous position as Paul's companion, and in spite of some pressure, he was allowed to remain uncircumcised. His circumcision was

refused because it was demanded by guileful enemies of the Gospel. In Paul's teaching the apostles at Jerusalem found nothing to correct and nothing defective. They simply recognised his independent mission.

Subsequently, at Antioch Paul administered to Peter public rebuke for withdrawing from the Gentiles, influenced by Jews from Jerusalem, after having fraternised with them. So great was Peter's influence that in his withdrawal he was followed by the other Jews at Antioch and even by Barnabas. Paul showed the gross inconsistency of his conduct, and reminded him that it was because the Law could not save that both Peter and himself put faith in Christ. And to the possible objection that if the Gospel brought down even moral men to the common level of sinners then was Christ a servant of sin, he replied by describing the spiritual life which had followed his death to the Law. By the metaphor of one who pulls down and then builds up, Paul exposes still further Peter's inconsistency; and concludes by declaring, as in DIV. II. he will prove, that the practical teaching involved in this withdrawal makes needless and useless the death of Christ and the grace of God therein revealed. To the great argument which now lies before us in ch. iii., these last words are the best possible stepping stone.

A marked feature of DIV. I. is the number of definite allusions to men conspicuous in the early Church, making it an invaluable contribution to the biography of the New Testament. The characters here depicted we will now study.

The term BROTHER OF THE LORD which in ch. i. 19 designates James, the first of the three pillars mentioned in ii. 9, demands attention. Brothers of Christ are three times (Mt. xii. 47ff, Mk. iii. 31ff, Lk. viii. 19ff; Mt. xiii. 55, Mk. vi. 3; Jno. ii. 12) associated with His mother. Our first thought is that these were later sons of Joseph and Mary: and this is supported by the word 'firstborn' in Lk. ii. 7. This opinion, of which however we have no certain trace earlier than Helvidius, (A.D. 380,) has been advocated lately by Meyer, Alford, Farrar, and others. The only historical objection to it, but a very serious one, is Jno. xix. 26, 27. For, if Mary had four sons of her own, who though perhaps not believers when Christ died became such (Acts i. 14: cp. 1 Cor. xv. 7) immediately afterwards, of whom one was worthy to be made (Gal. ii. 9) head of the Church at Jerusalem, we cannot conceive that Christ would set aside filial obligation by committing

His mother to the care of John, even though he was the betoved apostle and not improbably nephew to Mary. It is easier to believe that the word 'firstborn' had become, in consequence (Lk. ii. 23) of the Levitical ritual, equivalent to 'which openeth the womb' in Ex. xiii. 2, etc. Or, it might refer to a later son who died early. The perpetual virginity of Mary rests on no historical evidence; and therefore cannot be adduced as an historical argument.

That the Lord's brothers were sons of Joseph by an earlier wife, is a conjecture without other Scripture proof, and suggested simply by Jno. xix. 25. But it would most easily account for all the known facts of the case. Mary's step-sons would naturally be often with her. They would be called the Lord's brothers in the sense in which even Mary in Lk. ii. 48 calls Joseph His father; and in recognition of their almost sacred social nearness to Christ. And, if they were not her own sons it is much more easy to conceive reasons which prompted Christ to commit her to John. This opinion was held probably by Clement of Alexandria, and certainly by Origen, Eusebius, and the early fathers generally.

Another theory was in A.D. 382 advocated, and was probably invented by Jerome; and was accepted by Augustine and the Western fathers generally; viz. that the Lord's brothers were cousins, sons of His mother's sister, and that consequently the word 'brothers' is used of them only in a looser sense, as in Gen. xiii. 8, xxix. 12, Lev. xxv. 48. Jerome also supposes that in Mt. xiii. 55, Mk. vi. 3, James (or Jacob) and Joseph (or Joses) were identical with James the little and Joseph, sons of 'the other Mary,' in Mt. xxvii. 56, Mk. xv. 40; that their mother was 'Mary of Clopas,' whom he supposes to be Christ's 'mother's sister' in Jno. xix. 25; and that James the little was both 'the Lord's brother' in Gal. i. 19 and 'the son of Alphæus' in Mt. x. 3. This theory rests entirely on the supposition that Mary the mother of James and Joses (Mt. xxvii. 56, Mk. xv. 40) was sister to our Lord's mother: and for this there is no ground except the assumption, adopted without any proof by Meyrick in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i., p. 920 *b*, that in Jno. xix. 25 'Mary of Clopas' must necessarily be the same person as 'His mother's sister.' But surely it is as easy to understand this verse to mention four persons as three: cp. Acts i. 13. And it is in the highest degree unlikely, and so far as I know without parallel, that two sisters were commonly spoken of by the same name. Certainly, to suppose this, is much more

difficult than to find four persons mentioned in Jno. xix. 25. That two pairs of brothers (Mt. xiii. 55, xxvii. 56) bore the very common names James (or Jacob) and Joseph, cannot be accepted, even though the name Simon be added to each pair, as proving or hardly as suggesting that they were the same. The argument that, if James the Lord's brother were not the son of Alphæus, of this apostle nothing is known, loses all force amid the obscurity which surrounds the subsequent course of all the apostles except three. Thus vanishes New Testament support for Jerome's theory. And it has no support in early tradition.

This theory is, moreover, open to serious objection. The title assumed in Jude 1 suggests or implies that Jude's brother was the well-known leader of the Church at Jerusalem: for any other James would need to be distinctly specified. And, if he were the son of Alphæus, we are almost compelled to believe that the apostle 'Judé of James' was also brother of the Lord. But if two out of the four, or indeed if James the most illustrious of the four, were already enrolled among the apostles, it could not have been said, as in Jno. vii. 5, that Christ's 'brothers did not believe in Him.'

Nor is the looser sense given by this theory to the word 'brother' allowable in this case. For, without any hint of any unusual sense the men in question are again and again in all four Gospels, in the Book of Acts, and twice by Paul, called the Lord's brothers; never once His cousins or kinsmen. Yet for the relation of cousin there was a definite term both (Lev. xxv. 49) in Hebrew and (Col. iv. 10) in Greek. Just so, Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius, (*Church History* bk. iii. 20, 32, iv. 22,) speaks of James and Jude as the Lord's brothers, and of Simeon as His 'cousin,' and as His 'uncle's son.' The occasional use, in cases open to no mistake or where the distinction was unimportant, of the word *brother* in the looser sense of kinsman surely does not warrant us to interpret thus this frequent and matter-of-fact designation. The effect of giving to words so indefinite a meaning is seen in Estius, who supposes that the Lord's mother's sister also was only her cousin. Moreover, if the Lord's brothers were sons of Mary's sister, it is difficult to account for their association three times with Mary without any reference (especially in Jno. ii. 12) to their own mother.

Jerome's theory may therefore, as destitute of solid evidence in Scripture or tradition and as opposed to the plain meaning of a common word and to Jno. vii. 5, be confidently set aside. We

are therefore compelled to believe that the Lord's brothers were sons of Joseph. And we have found one strong reason, viz. the words from the cross to Mary and John; for surmising that they were his sons by an earlier wife. And this surmise we may accept, in the absence of other evidence, as the easiest explanation of the known facts of the case.

We must, accordingly, think of Jesus, not as a solitary child, but as one, probably the youngest, among four brothers and at least three sisters; and of Mary, not as devoting herself to the rapt contemplation of her one mysterious Son, but as discharging the many duties involved in the care of a large family. Into the privacy of that sacred home we are not allowed to intrude. And perhaps we need not envy its members their domestic nearness to the Saviour. It may be that even this nearness made it difficult for them to believe (Jno. vii. 5) that he whom they had known and cared for and played with in their own home as a little boy younger than themselves and needing their help was indeed the foretold deliverer and the Son of God. Perhaps it was only after He had risen and had appeared in special manner (1 Cor. xv. 7) to the oldest probably of the brothers that they were led (Acts i. 14) to bow to Him as their Lord.

On the whole subject see a very able dissertation in Lightfoot's *Galatians*.

Of JAMES, THE LORD'S BROTHER, the notices in the New Testament are few, but harmonious and definite. The position of his name in Mt. xiii. 55, Mk. vi. 3 suggests that he was the oldest of the four brothers. But this is no conclusive proof: for the order of Simon and Jude varies, showing that it is not according to age; and the subsequent fame of James would account for his place at the head of these lists. If he was Joseph's son by an earlier wife, James was some years, if the oldest son, several years, older than Jesus. This suggests an explanation of the fact that (Jno. vii. 5) about six months before His death James and His brothers did not believe in Christ, and ventured to give Him advice. Possibly, to this unbelief refers Mk. vi. 4: 'a prophet is not without honour except . . . among his kinsmen and in his own house.' As to Peter who denied Him, so to His brother James who hesitated to believe in Him, the Risen Saviour (1 Cor. xv. 7) specially appeared. This was probably to him, as was a similar event to Paul, the turning point in life. For, immediately after the ascension (Acts i. 14) the

brothers and mother of Jesus were associated with the apostles. The special message to James in Acts xii. 17 suggests that he then already occupied a prominent place in the Church at Jerusalem Still earlier Paul, on his first visit as a Christian, met James there. That at the conference at Jerusalem the name of James stands in Gal. ii. 9 before those of Peter and John, seems to imply that already James held the first place in the Mother-Church. And with this agrees the decisive part taken by James at the conference, as recorded in Acts xv. 13ff. That in Gal. ii. 12 some Christians are said to have come 'from James,' implies that they sheltered themselves under his name; and suggests that to their teaching the teaching of James was in less marked opposition than was that of Paul. And all this agrees with Acts xxi. 18—25, where James speaks as the recognised head and mouthpiece of the Christians at Jerusalem, all of whom are said to be 'zealous for the Law.' From 1 Cor. ix. 5 we learn that the brothers of the Lord, and therefore presumably this most famous of them, were married. And, even by the strictest observers of the Mosaic Law, marriage was held in honour.

That the Epistle of James was written by the Lord's brother, is suggested at once by its opening words, 'James, servant of God.' For, his unique position in the Mother-Church of Christendom would make further designation needless for him, but imperative for any other James. And modesty might easily restrain him from using a title of honour which others freely gave to him.

The Epistle is quoted as Scripture by the Greek fathers of the fourth century. Jerome (*Illustrious Men* ch. ii.) says: "James, who is called the brother of the Lord, by surname the Just . . . wrote only one Epistle, which belongs to the seven Catholic Epistles, which also itself is said to have been edited by some one else under his name, although gradually in process of time it has obtained recognition." Eusebius (*Church History* bk. iii. 25) says: "Of the books contradicted, but known nevertheless to most men, the so-called Epistle of James is in circulation, and that of Jude, and the Second Epistle of Peter, and the so-called Second and Third Epistles of John." So bk. ii. 23: "It must be known that it is accounted spurious: at any rate not many of the old writers have mentioned it. . . . Nevertheless we know that this with the others is publicly used in most Churches." Origen (*Comm. on John* vol. xix. 6) says: "If faith is mentioned, but it

be without works, such faith is dead; as we have read in the current Epistle of James." So *Notes on Exodus* p. 124: "For which cause also it has been said, God cannot be tempted with evil;" word for word from Jas. i. 13. In the Latin version of Origen by Rufinus, which however is not always reliable, we read (*Homilies on Exodus* viii. 4. p. 158): "But also the Apostle James says;" quoting Jas. i. 8. And so elsewhere. We have no earlier quotations. But a passage in Hermas (*Commandment* ix.) suggests strongly that the writer had seen the Epistle of James. It is included in the Syrian Peshito Version, made probably earlier than the fourth century; and is quoted in existing copies or versions of the works of Ephrem, a Syrian father of the same century. These are valuable testimonies to the genuineness of the Epistle. For, it was most likely, as written for Jewish Christians probably at Jerusalem, to be known in Eastern churches using the Aramaic language.

We notice at once the difference between these somewhat doubtful testimonies and the earlier and unanimous witnesses for the genuineness of the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians. And this weaker external evidence is not supported by any internal historical evidence such as that adduced for these Epistles. It is, however, supported by internal theological evidence so strong as almost to banish doubt, viz. a type of teaching differing widely from that of Paul, but in complete accord with the earlier and later surroundings; and the vocation, of the Lord's brother.

We can easily conceive that James, the son (Mt. i. 19) of 'a righteous man,' and trained in a home adorned by the piety of Mary, would, like Timothy, (2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15,) receive from the Jewish Scriptures rich spiritual nourishment. The Law would be to him a guide and delight, and a promise of a better revelation to come. But his nearness to Jesus would make it difficult to accept as the promised deliverer one whom as probably a younger brother he had loved and tended. And to him the Gospel itself would be, when at last the vision of the Risen Saviour had moved him to accept it without reserve, in some sense a consummation of the Law. Just as in the Epistles of Paul the antagonism of Law and Gospel recalls the writer's sudden transition from the one to the other, so the absence of any such antagonism in the Epistle of James is in complete accord with his gradual transition from Judaism to Christianity. Consequently, with James the word 'law' is always a title of honour; and even the Gospel is

(ch. i. 25, ii. 12) a 'law of liberty.' In short, the Epistle of James agrees so completely with the many casual but very definite references in the New Testament and (see below) in ancient tradition that we cannot doubt that it was written by the Lord's brother.

The apparent contradiction between James and Paul about justification is discussed in Dissertation iv.

The disposition and training of James were admirably fitted for the work he had to do. He became a medium of transition from Judaism to Christianity. Sympathising deeply with all that was good in the earlier revelation, and finding even in its ritual probably abundant edification, and therefore unwilling to break away from it, he would gain and retain the confidence of the best of the Jews. At the same time his opening words are a confession that 'Jesus Christ' is his 'Lord'; and he places side by side the names of God and Christ. The kernel of his religion was (ch. ii. 1) 'the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ.' And, like Paul's converts at Thessalonica, he was waiting (v. 7, 8) for 'the coming of the Lord.'

The chief aim of the Epistle is to rebuke those, be they Jews or Christians, who cling to some outward form, be it ritual or creed, and yet refuse to allow their religion to control their actions. That faith in Christ leads to right action, also Paul teaches constantly: cp. Gal. v. 16ff. But by confining our attention to the practical outworking of religion as the one test of its genuineness, the Epistle of James supplements the writings of Paul, and becomes an element in the sacred volume of abiding and infinite value.

Both in its outer form and in its spiritual significance, in its silence and in its teaching, the Epistle of James agrees closely with the First Gospel, which holds a place and discharges an office among the Gospels similar to that of this Epistle among the Epistles. Compare Jas. i. 2 with Mt. v. 10ff; *v.* 4 with Mt. v. 48; *v.* 20 with Mt. v. 22; *v.* 26 and iii. 2 with Mt. xii. 36; ii. 8 with Mt. xxii. 39; *v.* 13 with Mt. ix. 13; *v.* 14ff with Mt. vii. 21ff; iii. 12 with Mt. vii. 16; iv. 4 with Mt. vi. 24; *v.* 11 with Mt. vii. 1; *v.* 12 with Mt. x. 28; v. 2 with Mt. vi. 19; *v.* 12 with Mt. v. 33ff; etc.

By Luther, in the Preface to his German New Testament, A.D. 1522, this Epistle was rejected in strong language as unworthy of the Gospel. But the book he rejected would have saved him from many unguarded and injurious words which his enemies

have used as weapons against Protestantism, and would have supplied the chief defect of his theological teaching. How serious is this defect, and how sharp are the weapons thus put into the hands of adversaries, we see in Döllinger's *Reformation*, vol. iii., pp. 1—274.

Later tradition confirms, amid much which is evidently fabulous, the picture of James given above. Josephus (*Antiq.* xx. 9. 1) narrates that, when "James the brother of Jesus which is called Christ" was put to death by the high priest Ananus, it displeased the best men in the city and those strictest about the laws. Hegesippus, in a lost work quoted at length by Eusebius, (*Church History* bk. ii. 23.) says that "James the brother of the Lord because of his surpassing righteousness was called just;" that he was a Nazarite from birth; and that he alone used to go into the temple, i.e. into the sacred house itself. Hegesippus gives also an account of his death varying from that of Josephus. This quotation, in spite of much evidently incorrect, bears reliable witness to the opinions about James current in the second century. Similar evidence of the same date is found in the Clementine writings, which, while in the interests of Judaism bitterly opposing the teaching of Paul, without mentioning his name, make friendly reference to James.

Enough has now been said to prove that the character, position and influence, and writings of James deserve the most careful study of all who wish to understand the early development of Christianity.

Of PETER, the notices here accord exactly with those in the Gospels and in the Book of Acts, in reference both to his position in the Church and to his personal character.

In the Gospels, not only do we find him in the inner circle of three disciples at the raising of Jairus' daughter, at the Transfiguration, and in the agony of Gethsemane, but in all lists of the apostles his name is placed first: so Mt. x. 2, xvii. 1, xxvi. 37, Mk. iii. 16, ix. 2, xiii. 3, xiv. 33, Lk. vi. 14, viii. 51, ix. 28, Jno. xxi. 2, Acts i. 13; Jno. i. 45 being apparently the only exception. This remarkable uniformity suggests that among the twelve he was in some sense first. And this is put beyond doubt by Mt. xvi. 17—19; where the words 'Upon this rock I will build My Church,' following the emphatic words 'Blessed art thou Simon son of Jonah . . . and I say to THEE that THOU art Rock' and followed by 'I will give to thee the keys etc.' refer certainly to

Peter himself, designating him for a unique position in the Church. They were evidently designed to prepare Peter for special service, and to mark him out to his fellow-apostles as their divinely appointed leader. They are confirmed by the remarkable change in Lk. xxii. 31 from 'Satan has asked for YOU,' to 'I have made petition for THEE that THY faith fail not. And do THOU, when once thou hast turned again, make THY brethren firm.' But the true explanation of these words is in Acts i.—v., where we find Peter acting as the recognised leader and mouthpiece of the apostles and throwing wide open to all seekers for salvation the gates of the Kingdom of God, and where we see resting upon his immoveable courage the entire interests, and indeed the existence, of the infant Church. See *The Expositor* for April 1884.

In close agreement with all this, the motive of Paul's first journey to Jerusalem after his conversion is in Gal. i. 18 said to be, to see Peter. And, even when surrounded by other apostles, Peter is in ch. ii. 8 spoken of singly as entrusted with 'apostleship of the circumcision,' in a sense similar to Paul's unique commission for the Gentiles. This is the more remarkable because immediately afterwards (*v.* 9) the name of James is placed before that of Peter. The best explanation is that James was head of the Church at Jerusalem, whereas the twelve were sent to proclaim the Gospel to the world; and that among the twelve Peter held the first place.

The personal notices of Peter present a similar agreement. His concurrence, in Gal. ii. 9, with the teaching of Paul is a remarkable coincidence with Acts xv. 7ff, where similar teaching is attributed to Peter himself; and with xi. 17. And that, through fear of new comers from Jerusalem, Peter contradicted by action his own previous words, is in exact accord with his denial of Christ under the sudden influence of a servant maid. His subsequent almost reckless courage, contrasted with his timidity then, has often and justly been appealed to as the effect in him of the Spirit given at Pentecost. His weakness at Antioch is but another proof, in addition to thousands in all ages and circumstances, that the weaknesses of earlier days are an abiding source of danger even to those who have received the impulse of new spiritual life. As an embodiment of this lesson the incident referred to is of immense value.

These coincidences confirm strongly the genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians and the correctness of the narratives in the Gospels and the Book of Acts.

Of the two Epistles attributed to Peter, the former was accepted as undoubtedly genuine by all early Christian writers, and may be received with confidence as the voice of the Apostle of the Circumcision. The genuineness of the Second Epistle is surrounded by difficulties which cannot be discussed here.

Touching Peter's relation to the Church at Rome, Jerome (*Illustrious Men* ch. ii.) says: "Simon Peter . . . Prince of the apostles . . . in the second year of Claudius (i.e. A.D. 42) . . . went to Rome and there for twenty-five years occupied the priestly chair, until the last, i.e. the fourteenth, year (i.e. A.D. 67) of Nero. By Nero he was affixed to a cross, and thus was crowned with martyrdom, his head turned to the earth and his feet lifted high, inasmuch as he declared himself to be unworthy to be crucified like his Master." Eusebius (in the Armenian text of his *Chronicon*) gives the same date for the beginning of Peter's episcopate. But these statements are made unlikely in the last degree by (see Diss. i. 3, 7) Peter's imprisonment at Jerusalem in A.D. 44 and his presence in A.D. 51 at the conference mentioned in Gal. ii. 1—10; and by the absence of all reference to him in the Epistle to the Romans, and in that to the Philippians which was undoubtedly written from Rome.

About the death of Peter, we read in Eusebius, *Church History* bk. iii. 1, on the authority of Origen: "At the end, having come to Rome, he was empaled head downwards, himself having demanded to suffer thus." So bk. ii. 25; and *Demonstration of the Gospel* bk. iii. 5, vol. iv. p. 116. In his *Church History*, bk. ii. 25, Eusebius quotes Caius of Rome (A.D. 210 about) as saying: "If thou wilt go to the Vatican or to the Ostian Way thou wilt find the monuments of those (Peter and Paul) who founded this Church." He quotes also a letter of the same date to the Roman Church from Dionysius, bishop of Corinth saying that at both Corinth and Rome both Peter and Paul preached. Tertullian (*Against Marcion* bk. iv. 5) says: "the Romans . . . to whom Peter and Paul left the Gospel sealed by their own blood." Similarly, in his *Prescriptions against Heretics* ch. 36. Also Irenæus, *On Heresies* bk. iii. 1: "While Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome and founding the Church." So ch. 3. We see then that within little more than a hundred years of his death, in places so far apart as Corinth and Carthage, Rome and Gaul, and soon afterwards in Syria, it was confidently believed that Peter died at, or visited, Rome. And the literature of the early Church presents no trace of a con-

trary tradition. These testimonies and this silence admit of no explanation except that this belief was true. Had he died elsewhere it is most unlikely that no claim to this honour would have been put forward. Now if Peter died at Rome, it is easy to believe that to some extent he preached there. And this might easily give rise to the incorrect tradition that he and Paul founded the Church at Rome.

Many reasons unknown to us may have brought Peter to Rome. Possibly he came at Paul's request, that the Jewish and Gentile Christians might see, in the concord of the apostles of the circumcision and the uncircumcision the oneness of the Gospel which both preached.

From the above, which is a fairly complete statement of the evidence, it is clear that we have no historical proof that the bishops of Rome are in any sense successors of Peter and inheritors of the prerogatives given to him. Consequently, the primacy of Peter among the twelve apostles in no way supports the claim, put forward by the Bishops of Rome, to the primacy of the universal Church.

Of JOHN, the solitary mention in Gal. ii. 9 accords with the scanty reference to him in the Gospels and in the Book of Acts During the life of Christ we find him frequently associated with his brother James and with Peter; with Peter only, in Lk. xxii. 8 and (as we confidently infer) in Jno. xviii. 15, xx. 3. But only once (Mk. ix. 38, Lk. ix. 49) do we hear his voice; except once more (*v.* 54) along with James, who if we may trust the constant order of names was his older brother. As in Jno. xviii. 15 he had with apparently unwavering courage entered the judgment hall with Jesus, so in Acts iii. 1—iv. 20 he bravely stands by Peter in great peril, and sanctions his bold words to the Sanhedrin: but again his voice is not heard. In remarkable agreement with all this we find him in Gal. ii. 9 present among the men of repute at Paul's private interview at Jerusalem: but we have no recorded word from his lips. Similarly, in Acts xv. 6ff, assuming him to be present, he gives only silent approval to the words of Peter and James.

The long silence of John was at length broken by a voice which will never more be silent, viz. his Gospel and First Epistle. See further in Dissertation v.

Of this intimate companion of Jesus and profound student of His teaching, whose words re-echoing and expounding the

most precious words of his Master are light and life now to millions and will be so, probably in increasing measure, to the end of time, the only mention in the writings of Paul is Gal. ii. 9. And possibly the only meeting of these two greatest theologians of the New Testament was at this conference at Jerusalem.

BARNABAS was (Acts iv. 36f) a Levite, born at Cyprus but afterwards a member of the Church at Jerusalem and owning land there. So prominent was he as a preacher that he received from the apostles the name he afterwards always bore: 'Son of prophecy.' Cp. Acts xiii. 1, where among the prophets and teachers his name stands first. He knew (ix. 27) the story of Paul's conversion, recognised him at Jerusalem, and introduced him to the apostles. When the work began (xi. 21) at Antioch, the apostles wisely sent there Barnabas, as being from childhood associated with Gentiles. In the infant Church he used his gift of exhortation with delight and success. But, feeling the greatness of the work, and appreciating the powers of Paul, Barnabas persuaded him to come to Antioch: and for a whole year the two preachers laboured together. He went with Paul to Jerusalem taking alms for the poor; and then on his first missionary journey. That Barnabas was at that time looked upon as holding a place in the first rank in the Church, is implied in the title 'apostle' given to him, jointly with Paul, in Acts xiv. 4, 14. With Paul, Barnabas went to the conference at Jerusalem, and returned with him to Antioch. But after this he betrayed a momentary weakness by following the example of the Jewish Christians at Antioch who imitated Peter in withdrawing from the Gentiles. Paul's words in Gal. ii. 13, 'even Barnabas,' seem to betray surprise at the defection of his old comrade. Possibly this made Paul less reluctant to separate from Barnabas when the latter wished (Acts xv. 37) to take on their contemplated missionary journey 'John Mark, the cousin of Barnabas,' who had deserted them on a former journey. After the dispute, Barnabas went with Mark to Cyprus, his native island, doubtless to labour there in the Gospel. He now vanishes from view, except that in 1 Cor. ix. 6 he is spoken of by Paul as a fellow-worker, and as, like Paul, refusing to be maintained by those to whom he preached. These courteous words suggest that the parted comrades were afterwards reconciled.

Barnabas is spoken of with confidence by Tertullian (*On Modesty* ch. 20) as author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. And

at the end of the Sinai MS. of the New Testament and in some other Greek and Latin MSS. is an epistle commonly called by his name, and attributed to him frequently and confidently (e.g. *Stromata* bk. ii. 6, p. 161 : 20, p. 177) by Clement of Alexandria and (*Against Celsus* bk. i. 63) by Origen. But it is reckoned apocryphal by Eusebius (*Church History* bk. iii. 25) and by (*Illustrious Men* ch. 6) Jerome. Neither of these works can make good a claim to be from his pen.

Such are our scanty notices of one who occupied a front place in the founding of Gentile Christianity; and whose character is summed up (Acts xi. 24) in words which are a pattern of Christian eulogy, 'he was a good man and full of the Holy Spirit and of faith.' The past tense suggests perhaps that when those words were written he had passed away. We may therefore call them, written on the imperishable page of Holy Scripture, the Epitaph of Barnabas.

On TITUS see note under 2 Cor. ix. 5.

DIVISION II.

JUSTIFICATION IS BY FAITH, APART FROM LAW AND THEREFORE FROM CIRCUMCISION.

CH. III. 1—V. 13*a*.

SECTION IX.

BY FAITH THE GALATIAN CHRISTIANS RECEIVED THE SPIRIT.

CH. III. 1—5.

O senseless Galatians, who was bewitching you? before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly written as Crucified. 2 *This only I wish to learn from you, From works of law did ye receive the Spirit, or from a hearing of faith?* 3 *So senseless are ye? Having begun by* the *Spirit, are ye now by flesh being brought to maturity?* 4 *So many things have ye suffered*

in vain? If at least it be *indeed in vain.* 5 *He then who supplies to you the Spirit and works powers in* (or *among*) *you, is it by works of law or by a hearing of faith?*

We have assumed as the only explanation of this Epistle that in Galatia were men who bitterly opposed Paul's teaching that the good things of the New Covenant are received by faith and in proportion to our faith, apart from obedience to the Mosaic Law or to any law; and that these teachers insinuated that Paul's authority was inferior to that of the earlier apostles, because derived from them, and intimated that he had been unfaithful to the teaching they had committed to him. That his authority as a teacher, and his teaching, were not derived from them, Paul has proved by the facts of DIV. I.; and in so doing has prepared a way for a defence and exposition of his teaching, which is the second, and chief, matter of this Epistle. It occupies DIV. II.

Paul's words to Peter have brought him to the cross of Christ and to the self-sacrificing love there manifested. From these, as the best possible starting point, he now passes to a series of arguments with his readers in Galatia. And, while turning to them, in the light which shines from the Cross, his first thought is wonder at their strange defection.

1. *Senseless:* lacking power to grasp underlying realities, to read the meaning of that which was written in letters so public and plain. Same word in Lk. xxiv. 25, Rom. i. 14: cognate word in Rom. i. 20, RV. 'perceived'; Eph. iii. 4, Heb. xi. 3. *Bewitch:* deceive with magical art: same, or cognate, word in Sirach xiv. 6, xviii. 18, Wisdom iv. 12. *Was-bewitching:* while the process of fascination was going on. So strange is their spiritual blindness that Paul assumes that someone has thrown a spell over them; and asks who the magician is. *Who? you:* the deceiver confronting his victims. *Before whose eyes, etc.:* a fact proving the *Galatians* to be *senseless* and suggesting that they had been *bewitched. Openly-written:* publicly placarded, as in 1 Macc. x. 36, and probably Jude 4; or *written-beforehand*, as in Rom. xv. 4, Eph. iii. 3. Probably the former: for *beforehand*, which could only mean, before the wizard came, would, as already implied in the context, add no sense to the word *written;* whereas *openly* is a new and important idea, and one suggested by *before whose eyes.* The name of *Jesus Christ was written* in plain letters before the

eyes of Paul's readers where they and all men could read it: and it had been written as the name of one *Crucified*. Cp. 1 Cor. i. 23, ii. 2. This recalls 'crucified with Christ' in ii. 20, and 'Christ died in vain' in *v.* 21. All this proves their spiritual blindness, and suggests that they had been bewitched. For the teaching which had beguiled them set aside (ii. 21) practically the death of Christ.

The words *bewitch* and *eyes* recall a widespread superstition that from the eye of the enchanter to that of his victim passed a fascinating glance. So Plutarch, *Symposium* v. 7, p. 680 c: "about those said to bewitch and to have a bewitching eye." And Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Physical Problems* bk. ii. 53: "they send forth a ray as if poisonous and destroying from the pupil of their eye: and this entering in through the eyes of the envied one will change the soul and the nature." From the fascinating and deadly glance of the deceiver, the vision of Jesus crucified should have saved the Galatians.

2. First argument in defence of Paul's teaching. *This only:* this one argument being sufficient to decide the matter. *I wish to learn;* suggests deliberate and careful inquiry. *From works of law:* as in ii. 16. *The Spirit:* not His miraculous gifts merely or chiefly, of which the real worth was that they revealed His presence; but Himself dwelling in the hearts of all His people in all ages as their life and light and strength and joy, and the bearer to them and in them of all that Christ has and is. Cp. iv. 6, v. 16, 22, 25. The Spirit, Paul assumes that his readers have received; and that they know it. His inward presence was in the Apostolic Church outwardly manifested by supernatural gifts, especially by that of tongues: cp. Acts x. 44ff, xi. 17; viii. 17f; xix. 6. For it was important that both the receiver and others around should have unmistakable proof that he had received the Spirit. But the same Spirit in all His fulness dwells in us now, revealing Himself by a direct influence in our hearts moving us to call God our Father and breathing into us a strength and wisdom which we know to be not ours but God's; and in some measure revealing Himself to others by the moral beauty of those in whom He dwells.

The word rendered *hearing* denotes both the faculty (as in Mk. vii. 35, 1 Cor. xii. 17, Heb. v. 11) and the act (as in 2 Pet. ii. 8) of hearing. It therefore easily denotes the matter heard: for there can be no hearing without something heard. Same word three times in Rom. x. 16f: 'faith comes from hearing';

i.e. we first hear and then believe, and not otherwise can we believe. Similarly, the reception of the Spirit comes *from hearing:* the Galatian christians heard a word preached, and thus *received the Spirit.* Moreover, it was *a hearing of faith,* i.e. accompanied, and therefore characterised, by faith. Cp. Heb. iii. 12, iv. 2. The simplicity of this exposition renders needless the suggestion that faith was the matter heard, as in Rom. i. 5 it is the object to be obeyed.

This verse itself disproves the assertion of the disturbers that observance of the Mosaic Law is a condition of the blessiogs of the New Covenant. Already the readers had received the Holy Spirit who is Himself the great and promised (Ezek. xxxvi. 27) gift of that Covenant. Paul asks, 'Whence did you obtain this gift? Was it by obeying prescriptions of conduct, or by hearing and believing a preached word?' To state the only answer possible, is needless. A mere appeal to his readers' memory of their early Christian life is conclusive argument.

3. Questions developing the arguments involved in *v.* 2. *So senseless:* introducing the absurdity exposed in *v.* 3*b*. *Begun . . . brought-to-maturity,* or *completion,* or *perfection:* same words in 2 Cor. viii. 6, 10f, Phil. i. 6. *Being-brought-to-maturity:* a process now going on. Same word in 2 Cor. vii. 1, cognate word in 1 Cor. ii. 6: see notes. That the circumcision urged upon Titus is needful for entrance into the Christian life, *v.* 2 has disproved. Consequently, the only supposition still open to its advocates is that by obeying the Mosaic Law the Galatian Christians were *being brought to maturity. Spirit:* the Holy Spirit, but looked upon in the abstract as a life-giving principle. *Flesh;* implies that the Jewish restrictions which the false teachers sought to impose on the Galatians pertained only to outward, bodily life, to something done by, or to, the body. And this we can understand. For, in its inner significance none can fulfil the Law. They who trust to it for salvation do so by limiting their thoughts to small outward details, of piety or morality, which they are able to perform; and by rigorously performing these. Just so, the Judaisers insisted on (v. 3, vi. 12) circumcision and on (ii. 12) Mosaic distinctions of meat, things pertaining to the body. Paul reminds his readers that their spiritual life began by reception of the Holy Spirit, an inward, pervasive, life-giving principle; and asks whether, after such a beginning they are now being raised to a further and final stage of development by some hing pertaining only to their

outward covering of flesh and blood. Notice here the contrast of *Spirit* and *flesh* so deeply interwoven (cp. v. 16, vi. 8, Rom. viii. 4—13) into the thought of Paul.

It may be objected that Baptism and the Lord's Supper touch only the flesh, and that therefore the same argument would prove that they cannot be obligatory on those who have already received the Spirit. But their solemn institution by Christ at the founding of His Church breathed into the outward rite a spiritual significance which can never be separated from it. Probably (vi. 13) the disturbers in Galatia cared for nothing but the outward act of circumcision. Against them, therefore, this question would have irresistible force.

4. The mention of maturity suggests another element in the Christian life of the Galatians, viz. the *many things* they have *suffered*. These are most easily explained as persecutions aroused by Jews. For, the hostility to Paul (Acts xiv. 2, 19) in the neighbouring cities of Iconium and Lystra was caused by Jews; and unquestionably their reason was that his teaching broke down Jewish prerogatives. To similar hostility, for the same reason, the Galatian Christians must have been exposed. They knew how much direct and indirect persecution was included in *so many things*. But if the new teaching be true, these sufferings were *in vain*, i.e. (cp. iv. 11, 1 Cor. xv. 2) without sufficient cause and without result. For, against this teaching their enemies would have little or nothing to say. Similar argument in v. 11. Thus Paul appeals to his readers' outward, as in *v.* 2f to their inward Christian life. He asks, 'Are you willing to trample under foot as needless your own sufferings for the Gospel? These sufferings were provoked by the teaching you are now surrendering.' This question rests on the broad principle that whatever we have suffered for is dear to us. We do not like to admit that our sufferings have been needless and without result.

At the word *in vain* Paul starts, and adds as if apologizing for it *if at least* it be *in vain*. [εἴ γε implies emphatically that the foregoing question rests entirely upon the supposition embodied in the word *in vain*, which καί raises into conspicuous prominence. These particles therefore suggest scrutiny whether the supposition be correct.] These added words reveal Paul's reluctance to believe that these sufferings had been in vain; and thus suggest how serious his question is.

5. A repetition of the question in *v.* 2, transferred now from

entrance into, to present continuance in, the Christian life; a transfer suggested by the arguments in *vv.* 3, 4, which give great force to the question now asked. It is an appeal to present religious experience. 'If your Christian life began by reception of the Holy Spirit, it being thus impossible for it to be brought to maturity by anything merely outward, and if for this Christian life you have already suffered so much, I ask whether God is now *supplying to you the Spirit, etc.*' *Supplies:* see under 2 Cor. ix. 10; cp. Ph. i. 19. *The Spirit:* same full and general sense as in *v.* 2. Of this inward presence of the Spirit, endowment with supernatural *powers* was one visible and conspicuous manifestation. *He that supplies:* God, who (iv. 6) sends forth the Spirit of His Son into the hearts of His adopted sons. Paul thus supplements 'received the Spirit' in *v.* 2; and removes the controversy into the presence of God, the source of all good. The present tense, with the definite word *you*, implies that each moment the Spirit goes forth (cp. Jno. xv. 26) from God to men. Paul thus courteously acknowledges his readers' continued spiritual life; and assumes that they are conscious of a continuous reception of the Spirit by faith. This, the servants of Christ understand by personal experience. They find in their hearts an influence which raises them above themselves and enables them to live a life which is not their own but God's; and they find that in proportion to their faith, and from the very words believed, this life flows from Him to them. Of this divine life thus received, their obedience to God is a joyful result, but by no means an instrument or source.

Powers: either works of supernatural power, i.e. miracles, as in 2 Cor. xii. 12; or a supernatural capacity to work them, as 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29. Probably the latter, as more usual with Paul: but the practical difference is hardly perceptible. *In you*, or *among you:* both meanings embraced in the Greek word. The miracles were wrought *among* (same word in 2 Cor. xii. 12) the Galatians: but capacity for miracles was by the energy of God operating *in* the hearts of those who did them. This latter exposition is suggested here by the inwardness of the Spirit's operation, and is implied in my exposition of the word *powers*. Cp. Mt. xiv. 2, 1 Cor. xii. 6. This question implies that miracles were indisputably wrought in the apostolic Churches. Paul asks, 'What is the immediate source from which you receive day by day the Holy Spirit, and from which proceeds power to work miracles? is it works done in obedience to a rule of conduct, or

attention to, and belief of, a spoken word?' Answer is needless. They know that, when most firmly they believe the Gospel, then most richly does the Spirit animate and glorify their entire life, and then most mightily does the power of God endow them with supernatural capacities.

REVIEW. The suggestion that Christ died in vain, as would be the case if the teaching of the Judaizers were correct, reveals to Paul, as he turns to discuss the teaching they contradict, the mental blindness of the Galatian Christians. A single argument seems to him sufficient to settle the matter at issue. His readers' Christian course began with reception of the Spirit to be in them the animating principle of a new life. Paul asks whether they obtained the Spirit by means of obedience to legal prescriptions or by hearing with faith a preached word. Memory replies. The only supposition open is that obedience to law might lead them to a richer and higher Christian life. But the legal prescriptions of which the Judaizers think reach only to the material clothing of human life. Can mere bodily obedience develop a life begun by receiving a life-giving Spirit? The thought is absurd. Again, for the teaching of Justification by Faith apart from works of law, the Galatian Christians have already suffered persecution. Are they now prepared to admit that these sufferings were needless and profitless? These questions enable Paul to ask again in stronger form his first question. The Spirit whom day by day God still gives to his readers, and who reveals His presence by working miracles among them, do they receive by works of law or by faith? Thus not only their past but their present experience confirms the Apostle's teaching.

This section illustrates a principle in theology all important yet very liable to abuse, viz. that frequently abstract teaching may be verified by reference to our own spiritual life. To make subjective feelings a standard of truth, is perilous in the last degree. But our inner life is capable of, and deserves scientific analysis. Such analysis must, if correct, agree with the teaching of Christ as expounded by His apostles. And the comparison will in some cases detect a misunderstanding of the words of Christ, and in others confirm our confidence that we have rightly interpreted His words.

SECTION X.

JUST SO, BY FAITH ABRAHAM WAS JUSTIFIED.

CH. III. 6—9.

According as "Abraham believed God; and it was reckoned to him for righteousness." (Gen. xv. 6.) *Know therefore that they of faith, these are sons of Abraham. And the Scripture, having foreseen that by faith God justifies the Gentiles,* (or *nations,*) *announced beforehand good news to Abraham, that "In thee shall all the nations be blessed." So then they of faith are blessed with believing Abraham.*

The foregoing appeal to his readers' spiritual life past and present, Paul now supports by showing it to be in harmony with the spiritual history of the father of the Jewish nation. And this historical comparison becomes a starting point and basis of an exposition of the relation of the Gospel to the Law which occupies the remainder of DIV. II. Paul thus continues his defence, begun in § 9, of the doctrine of salvation by faith, from the legal restrictions with which some sought to overload and practically invalidate it.

6. That Paul's readers received the Holy Spirit by faith *accords* with a remarkable spiritual fact recorded of *Abraham* in Gen. xv. 6. Paul thus verifies his appeal to personal experience by comparison of the ancient Scriptures. An excellent example. *Believed God:* word for word from the LXX. (cp. Ex. xiv. 31, xix. 9) as in Rom. iv. 3, Jas. ii. 23; instead of 'believed in Jehovah' as in the Hebrew: probably because 'believe in' is not common in Greek. See my *Romans* p. 147. Abraham was sure that God will fulfil His promise to give him children as numerous as the stars: and this faith God reckoned to be fulfilment of the condition on which the promise was suspended. Thus by faith Abraham obtained the fulfilment of God's promise. The express and conspicuous record of this, and of the covenant which 'on that day' amid slain sacrifices God made with Abraham, is in remarkable agreement with the fact that by faith the Galatian Christians received the Spirit of God who is the bearer of all the blessings of the New Covenant.

7. Logical inference from the quotation in *v.* 6, which Paul bids his readers make. *They of faith:* i.e. whose relation to

God, and confidence, and character, are derived from, and determined by faith: so Rom. iii. 26, iv. 16; cp. ii. 8, iv. 14. *They* who have a spiritual life derived *from faith* are sharers of Abraham's spiritual nature; and in some sense derive it from him. For they follow in the way of faith which he trod. And Paul will show that the blessings they now enjoy are those promised to his children. They may therefore be called his *sons*.

8. Not only does Gen. xv. 6 prove that the men of faith are Abraham's sons, but in the spiritual facts of *vv.* 2 and 5 is a fulfilment of the first promise to Abraham so exact that it implies intelligent foresight. *The Scripture*: *v.* 22, iv. 30, Rom. iv. 3, ix. 17, x. 11, xi. 2: the passage of Scripture here quoted, viz. Gen. xii. 3. So always, apparently. The collective sacred writings are 'the Scriptures,' Rom. i. 2, xv. 4, xvi. 26. Cp. 'this Scripture,' Mk. xii. 10, Lk. iv. 21; 'another Scripture,' Jno. xix. 37; 'every Scripture,' 2 Tim. iii. 16. *Having-foreseen*: the divine foresight preceded the announcement recorded in Gen. xii. 3. A strong personification: cp. *v.* 22, iv. 30, Rom. ix. 17. That the solemn words of God are quoted simply as *the Scripture*, and that foresight is attributed to it as to a living person, reveals Paul's firm conviction both of the correctness of the record and of its divine authority. See my *Romans*, Diss. iii. Similarly, the law of England, enforced as it is by the power of the government, is sometimes spoken of as though it were a living person. And this reveals the unique position of the law among other writings. *By faith God justifies the Gentiles*: simple matter of fact, going on day by day while Paul wrote this Epistle, and foreseen by God before He spoke the first promise to Abraham. *Announced-beforehand-good-things*: viz. the spiritual good actually bestowed in Paul's day. Compare carefully Rom. i. 2 'the Gospel which He promised beforehand in Holy Scriptures.' The quotation is from Gen. xii. 3, changing only 'all the families of the earth' into *all the nations* or *all the Gentiles*, to agree with *justifies the Gentiles*. *In thee*: in virtue of something done to, or by, Abraham. So 1 Cor. xv. 22, 'in Adam all die.'

In Paul's day God was giving to all who believe, in all nations, the blessings of the New Covenant. This Covenant was a development of that which God made with Abraham in the day when he believed the promise that he should have children numerous as the stars. Consequently, their faith was a development of his faith. And in their justification was fulfilled the

promise made to Abraham before he left his own country. Paul will show in § 11 that not otherwise could this promise be fulfilled. So exact is the fulfilment that it must have been designed. He may therefore rightly say that the original promise, recorded in the ancient Writings which were to Israel the voice of God, was a foresight of the blessings which in his day God was actually bestowing.

9. Logical result of Gen. xii. 3 taken in connection with xv. 6, stated in a form similar to *v.* 7 and preparatory to § 11. *They of faith . . . believing Abraham:* the point of the argument. The blessings now received by those who believe in Christ are a fulfilment of the promises pledged to Abraham in the Covenant made with him by God in the day he believed. Consequently, they who share Abraham's faith share also with him the blessings which follow his faith.

Section 10 is preparatory to §§ 11, 12. In order to expound the true position and design of the Law, Paul has taken us into the presence of Abraham centuries before the Law was given, and proved from the Scriptures that he obtained the favour of God by faith, and that the justification of the Gentiles by faith is a fulfilment of the first promise made to Abraham. In the light of these facts he will now approach the Law.

SECTION XI.

THE LAW BRINGS A CURSE.

CH. III. 10—14.

For so many as are of works of law are under a curse: for it is written that "Cursed is every one that does not continue in all the things written in the Book of the Law to do them." (Dt. xxvii. 26.) "*And that in law no one is justified in the presence of God,* is *evident: because "the righteous man by faith will live."* (Hab. ii. 4.) "*But the Law is not by faith, but "He that hath done them will live in them:"* (Lev. xviii. 5.) "*Christ hath bought us off from the curse of the Law having on our behalf become a curse; (because it is written, "Cursed is everyone that hangs upon wood:"* Dt. xxi. 23;) "*that to the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus, that we might receive through faith the promise of the Spirit.*

Proof that the promise to Abraham was a foresight of the Gospel; viz. because not otherwise can that promise be fulfilled, since all who trust in law are under a curse: *v.* 10. That the Law cannot save, is proved by its difference from faith as a means of salvation: *vv.* 11, 12. The powerlessness of the Law to save rendered needful the death of Christ for the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham: *vv.* 13, 14.

10. Proof of *vv.* 8, 9. The original promise to Abraham is fulfilled in those who believe the Gospel: for all others, including all who trust in Law, *are under a curse.* Paul thus approaches, from the platform set up in § 10 on the firm foundation of God's first treatment of Abraham which agrees with his readers' own spiritual experience in § 9, the chief matter of DIV. II., viz. our relation to the Law. *So many as:* favourite phrase with Paul; *v.* 27, vi. 12, 16, Rom. ii. 12, vi. 3, viii. 14. *Of works of law:* whose religious life and claim to God's favour are derived from, and determined by, actions prescribed in a rule of conduct. That all such *are under a curse*, is proved by the very solemn and conspicuous words of Dt. xxvii. 26, which are a summary and culmination of the curses which Moses bade the Levites pronounce on Mount Ebal, and which embody the spirit of the entire Mosaic Law. The quotation is from the LXX., which however reads 'all the words of this Law.' The Hebrew, omitting *everyone* and *all* reads 'Cursed is he who does not establish the words of this Law to do them.' But the difference is unimportant: for these strong universal terms give the tenor of the whole Law. *The Book of the Law:* same phrase in Dt. xxxi. 26, Josh. i. 8, 2 Kings xxii. 8, 11. *Continue in:* abiding self-restraint within the limits marked out by the Law. *To do them:* purpose of this self-restraint.

This argument implies that none have kept the Law, i.e. that all have sinned. So Rom. ii. 1, iii. 9, 19, 23. To make us conscious of this, Paul chose the exceedingly broad and conspicuous summary of the Law of Moses in Dt. xxvii. 26, which reminds us that the Law is no mere series of regulations which we can easily keep but covers and touches all the actions of life and even the secret springs of conduct. Consequently, each deeper insight into the Law reveals transgressions undetected before and pronounces against us a fresh condemnation. And if so, the first great promise to Abraham can never be fulfilled to any one on the basis of law. It can be fulfilled only as the Galatian Christians have already received blessing from God, viz. by faith. And all this was foreseen by God when He spoke the promise.

11, 12. Further proof that the Law cannot save. *Justified in law:* same phrase in v. 4; and, from the lips of Paul, Acts xiii. 39: to have a rule of life as the surrounding element in which, and therefore the medium through which, a man receives justification. Cp. 'in Christ,' ii. 17, Acts xiii. 39; 'in the blood' and 'name of Christ,' Rom. v. 9, 1 Cor. vi. 11; iv. 4. *In the presence of God:* the Great Judge who knows the whole case and pronounces just judgment. Cp. 'righteous before God,' Rom. ii. 13, 2 Thess. i. 6; Rom. ii. 11, ix. 14, xi. 25. *No one is justified:* an abiding principle. No one obtains by accepting a rule of conduct as the surrounding element of his spiritual life, a favourable sentence in the presence of the heart-searching Judge. This is *evident* from the total difference between justification by faith and by law. These two incompatible principles Paul states in word-for-word quotations from Hab. ii. 4 and Lev. xviii. 5. God's words to Habakkuk are not perhaps given as independent proof that salvation is by faith: yet, taken in connection with Gen. xv. 6, they remind us that this doctrine has its roots in the records of the Old Covenant. See under Rom. i. 17. Not only did God accept Abraham's faith as a fulfilment of the required condition of the promise, but to Habakkuk He declared that by unshaken firmness, resting upon the believed word of God, the righteous man will survive the coming storm. But the main argument is the contrast with Lev. xviii. 5.

The Law is not by faith, or *from faith:* it is not derived from the principle 'believe and live.' This modest and indisputable assertion reveals the infinite difference between *the Law* and *faith*. *He that hath done, etc.:* a broad principle prefixed in Lev. xviii. 5 to a series of legal prescriptions. Same quotation in Rom. x. 5. It is the principle underlying all law. Reward follows right doing. The word *will-live* is a link uniting the two quotations; life through faith and life through obedience. That in each case bodily life is referred to, does not weaken the argument: for even bodily life is in the Old Testament a mark of the smile of God. The total incompatibility of these two channels of life, in connection with the exceeding breadth of the Law and with the Gospel announced by Christ and reflected from afar here and there in the pages of the Old Testament, makes it quite *evident* that on the basis of law no one stands before God justified.

13, 14. Relation of Justification by Faith to *Christ*. *Us:* rather emphatic: viz. Paul and the Jews who had received and broken the Mosaic Law. But this is true of all men: for

all have (Rom. ii. 15) broken *the* same *Law*, and lie under *the* same *curse*. *Bought-off:* same word in iv. 5, Eph. v. 16, Col. iv. 5: cp. *bought* in 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, 2 Pet. ii. 1, Rev. v. 9. The word rendered 'redeem' in Tit. ii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 18, Lk. xxiv. 21. (cp. Rom. iii. 24) is quite different; yet similar in sense. See under Rom. iii. 24. *The curse of the* Mosaic *Law:* that pronounced in Dt. xxvii. 26, quoted in *v.* 10. *Having become on our behalf a curse;* explains and justifies *bought off*, by stating the price, i.e the costly method, by which Christ set us free. *On our behalf*, or *for our benefit:* constant statement of the relation to us of Christ's death; ii. 20, Rom. v. 6ff, viii. 31f, xiv. 15, 1 Cor. i. 13, xi. 24, xv. 3, 2 Cor. v. 15. That the benefit was rendered by Christ taking our place, we learn here from the context. For the price takes the place of the thing *bought:* and we were made free from the curse by Christ placing Himself under it. And, since that curse was death, we rightly say that Christ died in our stead. But this is only a forceful way of stating the great fundamental doctrine of Rom. iii. 24—26, (see note,) that we are justified by means of the death of Christ. *A curse:* an example and embodiment of a divine curse. What that is, we learn by contemplating Christ Crucified. The word was suggested by the Hebrew form of Dt. xxi. 23, 'a curse of God is a hanged one.' So Zech. viii. 13, 'ye were a curse among the nations.' A very close parallel in 2 Cor. v. 21.

Because it is written, etc.: an important quotation (Dt. xxi. 23) placing Christ actually under *the curse of the Law;* slightly changed from the LXX. in which *upon wood* is repeated from *v.* 22. These words are needful here, to give the full sense of the original. As in the quotation in *v.* 10, the LXX. strengthens the passage by inserting *everyone*. The Hebrew equivalent of the word *wood* denotes primarily a tree, as in Gen. ii. 9, 16; then the material derived from trees. The corresponding word denotes in classic Greek wood, or things made from wood, and very rarely or never a tree. But it is used by the LXX. for the above Hebrew word even when used in this last sense, as in Gen. ii. 9, 16; and in the same sense and reference is found in Rev. ii. 7, xxii. 2, 14, 19. But elsewhere in the N. T. there is no need to give it any other than its ordinary sense of a piece of wood. The original words of Dt. xxi. 23 embrace both a living tree, and any pole from which a dead body might be hung. A corpse hanging from a tree or pole, as being a conspicuous presentation of death and of crime, was marked out in the Law

as specially accursed; and was not allowed to remain over night. By a strange concidence (for crucifixion was a Roman punishment) Christ came under this legal curse: and in obedience to the Law His body was removed lest even that Most Sacred Temple should defile the coming Sabbath. And this apparently small coincidence reveals how completely He had taken upon Him our curse. Thus the Law pronounced a curse upon the All-Blessed One; and by so doing proclaimed itself to be imperfect and passing.

14. Double purpose for which Christ 'became a curse.' It thus expounds 'on our behalf.' *To the Gentiles*, or *nations*: emphatic. *The blessing of Abraham*: recorded in *v.* 8 as proclaimed in Gen. xii. 3. *In Christ Jesus.*] Not until Christ came and bore our curse, and only in proportion to our spiritual union with the Risen Saviour, can the blessing of Abraham reach us. *That we might receive, etc.*: further purpose, expounding the practical significance of the foregoing. It leads us back to the spiritual facts of *vv.* 2—5, with which the case of Abraham was in *v.* 6 said to agree; thus preparing a way to iv. 6 and v. 16. *The promise of the Spirit*: viz. that the Spirit shall be given: Joel ii. 28, Ezek. xxxvi. 27; Jno. xiv. 16, 26. *Receive* (or *obtain*) *the promise*: receive its fulfilment; Heb. x. 36, Lk. xxiv. 49, Acts i. 4. *Through faith*, joins § 11 through § 10 to § 9. It marks the completion of the matter introduced in *v.* 2.

Verses 13, 14 assume that Christ was crucified in order that God's purpose of mercy might be accomplished in us, a fundamental doctrine which probably no Christian would deny. But, if crucified, he fell under a curse conspicuously pronounced by the Law. Now upon all men the Law pronounces a curse: for none have fully obeyed its commands. Consequently, Christ fell under the curse of the Law in order to rescue us from it. And only through Him, and to those who believe the Gospel, can the original promise made to Abraham be fulfilled: for all others are shut out from all blessing by the curse of the Law. Therefore, Christ bought us off from the curse of the Law by Himself submitting to its curse. Moreover the Spirit given to those who believe is Himself a fulfilment, and the agent of the complete fulfilment, of the first promise made to Abraham. Consequently, this gift was the aim of the death of Christ.

In § 9 Paul appealed to his readers' past and present experience in proof that the Holy Spirit, the great gift of the New Covenant, comes by faith and not by works of law. In § 10 he

shows that this agrees with the story of Abraham; and asserts that it is a fulfilment of the original promise to Abraham. This last assertion, he proves in § 11 by showing that in no other way can this promise be fulfilled; that as a means of salvation obedience to law is incompatible with faith, by which he has already shown that Abraham obtained God's favour; and that the only conceivable explanation of the death of Christ is that He died that in the spiritual facts of § 9 the promise to Abraham might be fulfilled.

SECTION XII.

YET THE LAW CANNOT SET ASIDE THE STILL EARLIER PROMISE.

CH. III. 15—18.

Brethren, after the manner of men I say it. *Even a man's confirmed covenant, no one sets aside or adds conditions to.* [16] *Now to Abraham were spoken the promises, and to his seed. He does not say, "And to seeds" as of many, but as of one, "And to thy seed," which is Christ.* [17] *But this I say, a covenant before confirmed by God, the Law proclaimed four hundred and thirty years afterwards does not annul, in order to make of no effect the promise.* [18] *For if the inheritance* is *by law,* it is *no longer by promise. But to Abraham God graciously granted it by promise.*

The Law is not a later-imposed condition: for, if it were, it would prevent fulfilment of the promise, which was earlier than the Law and had reference not only to Abraham but to Christ. Paul will thus prove that the Law (which cannot save: § 11) cannot hinder salvation.

15. *After the manner of men* (literally, *according to man*, as in i. 11) *I say:* Rom. iii. 5, 1 Cor. ix. 8: 'taking human nature and its customs as my standard.' Hence, Paul goes on to speak of *a man's covenant.* He thus appeals to the principles of human morality in proof of what God will do. Cp. Mt. vii. 11. This implies that what is wrong in *man* cannot be right in God. *Covenant:* an engagement in which men mutually bind themselves to do certain things on certain conditions. See my

Romans pp. 136, 266. *Confirmed:* ratified, and thus made legally binding. Same word in Gen. xxiii. 20. 'Although it be only a man's engagement, yet, when ratified, no one *sets* it *aside*.' Nor, when a man has bound himself to do something on certain conditions, does he *add* other conditions and require their fulfilment before he performs his part of the engagement. For he would thus practically *set aside* the covenant.

16. This verse applies *to Abraham*, and through him to Paul's readers, the principle stated in *v.* 15. They would remember that God's words *to Abraham* were *the* well-known *promises;* and that in the day of Abraham's faith (Gen. xv. 18) these were confirmed by a solemn 'covenant.' This familiar historical connection is the historical link binding *vv.* 16 and 15. Cp. *v.* 17, and Eph. ii. 12 'the covenants of the promise.' Nearly all *the* many *promises to Abraham* have the conspicuous addition, *and to thy seed:* Gen. xiii. 15, (and in LXX. *v.* 17,) xvii. 8, 19. These words are quoted here to prove that on the principle asserted in *v.* 15, persons still living can claim the promises *to Abraham*. To complete this proof, Paul will show in *v.* 16*b* that these added words pertain to Christ. *To Abraham . . . and to* (or *for*) *his seed:* the Greek dative includes both him to whom, and those for whom, *the promises were spoken;* a latitude which no English rendering can reproduce.

He does not say: probably God; for the words referred to are in *the promises* spoken by Him. Instead of 'thy sons' (as in the frequent phrase 'sons of Israel': Ex. i. 13, xii. 37, 40) God says always (even in Gen. xxvi. 24) *thy seed;* using a singular noun. This proves clearly that He looked upon Abraham's descendants as one organic whole. The plural of the Hebrew word rendered *seed* denotes in 1 Sam. viii. 15, where alone in the O. T. it is found, (cp. a similar word in Isa. lxi. 11, Dan. i. 12, 16,) not persons but grains of seed; and therefore could not have been used to denote descendants. But the plural of the corresponding Greek word was sometimes, though rarely, so used: e.g. Plato, *Laws* p. 853*c*. Paul therefore adopts it here as the easiest way of describing popularly a grammatical construction conspicuously absent from the promises to Abraham. The exact words *and to thy seed* are found in (LXX.) Gen. xiii. 15, 17, xvii. 8. The word *and* recalls a conspicuous addition in the promises to Abraham.

Which seed, looked upon as one organic whole, *is Christ:* a concisely expressed deduction from *v.* 14*a*. *Is;* denotes coinci-

dence or practical identity, as in 2 Cor. iii. 17, 1 Cor. x. 16, (xii. 12,) Rom. i. 12, 16. The promise to Abraham's seed is fulfilled, by God's design, in those united to Christ, in them only, and in virtue of their union with Him. The personality of Christ enfolds them: (for they have put on Christ, *v.* 27:) and His relationships and rights are theirs. Thus the personality of Christ is in some sense co-extensive with the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham. And, since this was originally designed by God, and since the fulfilment of the promises to Abraham will set up the kingdom of Christ, Paul does not hesitate to say in *v.* 19 that He was 'the seed to whom the promise was made,' and to say here that the seed *is Christ*. The profound truth thus expressed, viz. the practical identity of Christ and His people, has many applications and is worthy of careful study. The expression itself was suggested by the form, conspicuous by its uniformity, of the promises to Abraham's descendants.

17. *But this I say*, or *mean:* practical bearing of *vv.* 15, 16 on the matter in hand. Verse 15 states a universal principle of human morality: *v.* 16 proves that God's relation to Abraham and to his spiritual children comes under it: and *v.* 17 shows how the principle applies to them. God bound Himself (Gen. xv. 18, xvii. 2) by *a covenant* to fulfil 'the promises to Abraham.' *Ratified:* the legal obligation *by* which *God* condescended to bind Himself. Possibly Paul has in mind (cp. Heb. vi. 17) the solemn oath in Gen. xxii. 16. The prefixed word *before* emphasizes the fact that this confirmed covenant was earlier than *the Law*. *Does not annul:* an unchangeable principle. For God to attach to the promises, centuries after He had confirmed them by oath, an impracticable (*v.* 10) condition, would be in effect to set aside His own covenant. *In order to make-of-no-effect* (see under Rom. iii. 3) *the promise:* the only conceivable purpose of God for annulling the covenant by adding a later and impossible condition, viz. to avoid fulfilling His own *promise*, i.e. to make it practically inoperative. To denote a mere result, another familiar Greek phrase would have been used, as in 1 Cor. i. 7, v. 1, xiii. 2. All inevitable results of God's action, being foreseen, are taken up into His plan, and are therefore His definite purposes. Consequently, had God afterwards made His promises to Abraham conditional on obedience to the Law, He would have done so with a deliberate purpose of evading His own promises. For God to plot this, and to accomplish it by giving the Law at Sinai, is inconceivable.

18. Explains how the Law, if it were a condition, would neutralise the promise. *The inheritance:* the benefits to Abraham's children, bodily and spiritual, in virtue of their relation to him. It is a constant designation of the land of Canaan given to Israel as descendants of Abraham: Dt. iv. 38, xv. 4, xix. 10, etc. But Canaan was only an imperfect firstfruit of the infinite blessing which comes and will come to all 'who walk in the steps of the faith of their father Abraham.' Thus will he become (Rom. iv. 13) heir of the world. *By law:* cp. *v.* 21: derived from a rule of conduct, i.e. by obeying it. *No longer:* logical result, as in Rom. xi. 6, vii. 17. *By promise:* derived from an announcement of good things from God to us. As shown in *vv.* 11, 12, these modes of derivation, viz. man's exact obedience to words of command, and God's fulfilment of His own promise, are utterly incompatible. We must therefore choose between them. Which alternative is the true one, the following historical statement determines.

By promise: more fully, *by means of promise.* Before giving the inheritance God gave a promise, and made belief of it the condition of fulfilment. The promise was thus the instrument and channel *through* which the inheritance came. *Graciously-gave it*, or *gave it as an act of grace:* Rom. viii. 32, 1 Cor. ii. 12: akin to 'gift-of-grace,' in Rom. i. 11, v. 15f, etc.; and to the word 'grace' in Gal. i. 3, 6, 15, etc. It suggests an argument. For the promises to Abraham were evidently undeserved favour. Therefore the inheritance does not come through law: for then (Rom. iv. 4f) it would be matter not of favour but of debt. [The Greek perfect directs attention to the abiding results of God's word of grace to Abraham, reminding us that it created an era in his history and in that of the world. But since Paul refers to a definite event or events in the past, the use of English tenses requires the preterite. The RV. *hath granted it* does little or nothing to reproduce the force of the Greek perfect; and is very uncouth.]

REVIEW. In proof that the benefits of the Gospel are obtained by faith and not by obedience to law, Paul has appealed to his readers' spiritual life, and has shown that it accords with the story of Abraham. Not otherwise can the blessings promised to Abraham's children be obtained: for the Law pronounces a universal curse, from which we are rescued only by the curse which fell upon Christ. Now if, hundreds of years after giving the promises and confirming them by a covenant, God had made

their fulfilment conditional on obedience to law, He would have set aside His covenant, thus violating a recognised principle of human morality; in order to evade fulfilment of His promises. The evasion would be complete: for obedience as a condition of benefit is quite different from the undeserved favour manifested in God's promises to Abraham. This last verse opens a way for the argument of § 13 which rests upon the total difference between law and promise.

Paul's appeal in *v.* 16 to a small grammatical distinction reveals his confidence that the Book of Genesis is a correct record of God's words to Abraham. His argument rests, however, not on one passage, but on an expression used some fifteen times and forming a conspicuous feature of the narrative. In this, Paul is a pattern to us. Appeal to general usage is the only safe method of Biblical theology. Moreover, the point in question is only a detail confirming an argument already conclusive, by an interesting coincidence which cannot be explained except on a principle involved in the argument. This allusion to a grammatical detail thus differs altogether from the childish word-play of the Jewish writers.

THE PRECISE STATEMENT of time in *v.* 17, 430 years, recalls Ex. xii. 40, 41, where (and there only) the same period is given twice, yet not as the time from Abraham to the Exodus, as Paul here says, but as the duration of the sojourn in Egypt. This discrepancy is evidently derived from the LXX., which Paul usually quotes, and of which the Vat. MS. reads 'which they sojourned in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan,' while the Alex. MS. adds further 'they and their fathers.' With this last agrees the Samaritan Pentateuch. But the Hebrew text (given in the AV.) is open to no doubt. For it is supported not only by the Peshito Syriac and the Latin Vulgate but also by internal evidence: for the Vatican reading betrays a clumsy attempt to shorten the stay in Egypt, perhaps to bring it into harmony with the genealogy in Ex. vi. 16—20; and the Alex. reading looks like a correction of the other. Moreover, it is much more natural, in reckoning the time of the departure from Egypt, to give the length of the sojourn there than the period elapsed since Abraham entered Canaan. It is also difficult to suppose that in Gen. xv. 13 the 'land not theirs,' in which Israel was to dwell 400 years and which seems to be contrasted with the land promised to Abraham, includes both Egypt and Canaan, countries so different in their relation to Israel. The word rendered 'generation' in *v.* 16 is an indefinite

term for a human life or the men living at one time, e.g. Num. xxxii. 13; and is different from the word used in Gen. xi. 10, 27, etc. The shorter chronology seems to be supported by the genealogy in Ex. vi. 16ff: but this is neutralised by the longer genealogies in Num. xxvi. 29, Josh. xvii. 3; Ruth iv. 18ff, 1 Chr. ii. 5f; ii. 18; vii. 20ff. For it is more likely that names have fallen out of the shorter list than been inserted fictitiously into the longer one. Moreover, if taken as a complete list, Ex. vi. 16—20 does not give the length of the stay in Egypt: for in this case the lives would overlap to an extent which is not specified, leaving us without any exact chronological data. The aggregate of these lives, viz. 487 years, rather suggests that they are in the main consecutive, and that these four lives represent the four centuries or generations which God foretold should live and be spent in Egypt. We find therefore no reason to suspect corruption in the plain historical statement of our best authority for the Old Testament, the Hebrew text.

The above discrepancy is found also in Josephus who in *Antiq.* ii. 15. 2 follows the LXX. by interpreting the 430 years to include Abraham's sojourn in Canaan, yet in ch. 9. 1 and *Wars* v. 9. 4 speaks of the bondage in Egypt as lasting 400 years.

Against the foregoing historical arguments the cursory allusion in Gal. iii. 17 has no weight. About trifling discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek texts, Paul probably neither knew nor cared. And they have no bearing whatever upon the all-important matter he has here in hand. He adopted the chronology of the LXX. with which alone his readers were familiar; knowing, possibly, that if incorrect it was only an understatement of the case.

The above discussion warns us not to try to settle questions of Old Testament historical criticism by casual allusions in the New Testament. All such attempts are unworthy of scientific Biblical scholarship. By inweaving His words to man in historic fact, God appealed to the ordinary laws of human credibility. These laws attest, with absolute certainty, the great facts of Christianity. And upon these great facts, and on these only, rest both our faith in the Gospel and in God and the authority of the Sacred Book. Consequently, as I have endeavoured to show in my *Romans* Diss. i. and iii., our faith does not require the absolute accuracy of every historical detail in the Bible, and is not disturbed by any error in detail which may be detected in its

pages. At the same time our study of the Bible reveals there an historical accuracy which will make us very slow to condemn as erroneous even unimportant statements of Holy Scripture. And, in spite of any possible errors in small details or allusions, the Book itself remains to us as, in a unique and infinitely glorious sense, a literary embodiment of the Voice and Word of God.

SECTION XIII.

THE LAW WAS DESIGNED TO LEAD US TO FAITH IN CHRIST.

CH. III. 19—24.

What then is *the Law? For the sake of the transgressions it was added, until the Seed should come to whom the promise had been made; ordained by the agency of angels, in* the *hand of a mediator.* [20] *But the mediator does not pertain to one person: and God is one person.* [21] *The Law then* is it *against the promises of God? Far from it. For if there had been given a law able to give life, really from law would righteousness be.* [22] *But the Scripture has shut up together all things under sin, that the promise may by belief of Jesus Christ be given to those who believe.* [23] *But before that the belief came, we were kept in ward under law, being shut up together for the belief about to be revealed.* [24] *So that the Law has become our tutor for Christ, that we might be justified by faith.*

19. After showing what *the Law* is not, viz. a later-imposed condition practically annulling the earlier promise, Paul will now say *what* it *is*. And this is absolutely needful to his argument. For, indisputably, the Law holds an all-important place in the Old Covenant: and until this place be found we shall ever be in danger of misinterpreting its purpose. Paul asks, 'since the inheritance is not derived from a rule of conduct, *what then* is the meaning and aim of *the Law?*' To this question, § 13 is the answer. Cp. *v.* 24.

It was added; recalls 'adds conditions to,' in *v.* 15, and reminds us that the Law was later than the promises, and suggests that it was subordinate to them. *For-the-sake-of:* a general term noting any kind of motive, something either existing or thought of; cp. Tit. i. 11, Jude 16. Grammatically it might

mean 'because of the sins committed before the giving of the Law'; or perhaps, 'in order to restrain sin in the future.' But these senses are foreign to the context. Paul's meaning is expounded, and his teaching here completed, in *v.* 22; and in Rom. v. 20, which teaches that the Law was given in order that it might be broken, that thus the previous moral fall of Adam might multiply into many breaches of a written law. And this meaning is confirmed by the word *transgressions*, which denotes (Rom. iv. 15) violations of actual commands. To men born in the power of sin and therefore unable to obey, God gave a law. The only possible result was disobedience; which, since it was inevitable and foreseen, must have been taken up by God into His plan, and in this sense designed by Him. Paul speaks therefore of *the* various subsequent *transgressions*, which were a definite object of God's thought, as being His motive for giving the Law. The ultimate purpose of blessing behind this immediate purpose is stated in *v.* 22 and in Rom. v. 21.

Until the Seed, etc.: a second detail about the Law, and another mark of its subordinate position. It was an addition; and was only for a time. Cp. *v.* 25. *The Seed:* Christ, as declared in *v.* 16. *To whom the promise had been made:* Greek perfect as in *v.* 18. His coming gave birth to, and He was thus practically identical with, the many nations of Abraham's spiritual children; in whom were fulfilled the promises to his seed, and whom God had specially in view when giving these promises. And their fulfilment involves the establishment of Christ's kingdom. Consequently, the promises given to Abraham and designed to be fulfilled in those who in after-ages should believe the Gospel, were designed also for Christ.

Ordained by the agency of angels: a third detail about the Law, revealing its importance as superhuman. Paul thus, as his wont is, pays it due honour. But even these words of honour place the Law below the Gospel. Same teaching in Acts vii. 53, words heard probably by Paul before his conversion; and in Heb. ii. 2, where the Law is contrasted with the Gospel. That it was common among the Jews, we infer from Josephus, *Antiq.* bk. xv. 5. 3, "We have learnt from God by the agency of angels the best of the decrees and the most sacred of the things in the Law"; and from Philo, vol. i. 642, "Angels announced the commands of the Father to His children." All this proves how firmly in Paul's day both Jews and Christians held that the Law of Moses was given by angels. Yet of a plurality of angels at

the giving of the Law the only mention is Dt. xxxiii. 2, which we may perhaps render, 'Jehovah came from Sinai . . . He drew near from multitudes of holiness,' as though, surrounded by armies of the holy ones of heaven God proclaimed the Law. This the LXX. render 'with myriads of Kadesh, from His right hand angels with Him.' Cp. Ps. lxviii. 17, 'The chariots of God are multitudes, thousands twice-told: the Lord is among them: a Sinai in holiness.' But these two ambiguous passages hardly account for definite teaching so widely accepted. Its source is rather the frequent mention of an angel as the medium through which God spoke to Moses. So Ex. iii. 2, xxiii 20, xxxiii. 2, Num. xx. 16: cp. Acts vii. 30, 'there appeared to him an angel in a flame of fire'; *vv.* 35, 38, 53. This derivation is not disproved by the plural number, *angels*: for this merely leaves undetermined whether the angel of the Lord was always the same heavenly person, and asserts in general terms that the Law of Moses was given by angelic agency. And this general statement is sufficient to prove the infinite importance of the Law.

That the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament was the pre-existent Son of God, was held by the earliest fathers. So Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho*, § 56ff) argues at length; and Tertullian, *Against Marcion* bk. ii. 27, iii. 9. But of this opinion we can find no trace in the New Testament: and, had it been true, it could hardly have been passed over in silence. Indeed, had the Angel in the burning bush and the pillar of cloud been immediately the Son of God, then by Him was the Law spoken at Sinai: and, if so, Paul's words here would fall so far below the truth that we cannot conceive him using them. And the argument of Heb. ii. 1ff would be invalid. Accordingly, Augustine (*On the Trinity* bk. iii. 11. 22f, 27) argues forcefully that through a created angel God appeared and spoke to Moses. So Jerome on Gal. iii. 19, and other later writers. And this seems the best explanation. In Dan. xii. 1, x. 13 we find Michael, one of the chief angel-princes or archangels, who cannot well be other than a created angel, standing in special relation to Israel. This suggests that possibly he led Israel in the wilderness.

That God spoke to Israel His Law through a created angel, foreshadowed the day when through the face and lips of the Eternal Son, incarnate, God showed Himself and spoke to, and dwelt among, men. And this is the true relation between the Angel of the Lord and the Son of God. The one was forerunner of the Other Moreover, whatever God does visibly He does

through the Son. Mediately, therefore, through the Son God spoke the Law to Israel.

A fourth detail about *the Law*. *A mediator:* Moses, who received from God through the agency of the angel the various commands of the Law. *In the hand of:* common Hebrew phrase for agency; so Num. iv. 37, 45, cp. Acts vii. 35. But it reminds us that *in* the very *hand* of Moses (cp. Ex. xxxii. 15) were brought down from Sinai the tables of stone which were the noblest part, and a visible and permanent embodiment, of the Law. Cp. Lev. xxvi. 46: 'the Laws which Jehovah gave between Himself and the sons of Israel in Mount Sinai in the hand of Moses.' *Mediator:* once in the LXX., Job ix. 33. By Philo, Moses is twice called *a mediator:* vol. i. 642 referring to Ex. xx. 19, and vol. ii. 160 referring to xxxii. 7. It reminds us that, not only did God select Moses to be His means of communicating with Israel, but that (Ex. xx. 19) he was requested by Israel to be such, and that through him the people promised (xix. 8, xxiv. 3) to obey the commands of God. Thus in every sense Moses was *a mediator* through whom was negotiated the Covenant of God with Israel.

Led astray by 1 Tim. ii. 5 and Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, Origen and most of the Fathers understood the mediator to be Christ. But He was mediator of a Better Covenant. This mistake warns us not to accept as decisive the united judgment of even the greatest of the Fathers. We have means and methods of research unknown to them.

20, 21*a*. An objection provoked by the word 'mediator,' and noted here in order to be overturned by, and thus to prompt, a further exposition of the purpose of the Law. *The mediator:* any mediator, but looked upon as embodying and representing a definite conception. Hence the article. *Does not belong to one:* the very conception involving two contracting parties, each of whom is bound by the contract. 'In the hand of a mediator. Yes. And this implies that by the Old Covenant more than *one person* was bound; i.e. someone else besides *God* who *is* only *one person*.' Thus the obligation accepted by Israel at Sinai, which seemed to be overlooked in the argument of *v.* 17, is silently brought before us, that the doubt thus suggested may be dispelled. The obscurity of *v.* 20 no loss. For it is not a link in the argument; but merely suggests the important objection stated in *v.* 21*a*, which is overturned in *vv.* 21*b*, 22, viz., *the Law then*, is it *against the promises of God?* The reply to this objection completes the answer to 'what then is the Law?'

in *v.* 19. Since *the Law* was an engagement binding not only God but another party, viz. Israel, it might be thought that this engagement would limit, and thus practically set aside, *the* earlier *promises* to Abraham. If so, it would be *against the promises of God*. This question Paul answers by an indignant negative; and supports his denial by completing in *v.* 22 his exposition of the purpose of the Law.

Of the New Covenant Christ is mediator, inasmuch as through Him God draws us to Himself. But Christ was not, as Moses was, requested by men to be a medium of communication between them and God. Consequently, he was not a mediator in the same sense as Moses. But to any contrast between them there is no reference here.

An account of the many expositions of *v.* 20 is given in the commentary of Meyer. See additional note on p. xxiii.

21*b*, 22. Proof that the Law is not 'against the promises.' According to Paul's wont, the weight of the proof rests on the second clause, viz. *v.* 22, *that the promise may be given, etc.;* for which *v.* 21*b* prepares the way. *Give-life:* same word in Rom. iv. 17, viii. 11, 1 Cor. xv. 22, 36, 45, 2 Cor. iii. 6; Jno. v. 21, vi. 63. It denotes here eternal *life*. This is the ultimate design of the Law, Rom. vii. 10: and in Gal. iii. 22 we shall see the design accomplished. But that the *Law* is not of itself *able to give life*, Paul proves by saying that this would involve *righteousness actually* derived *from law*, which in *vv.* 10—13 he has shown to be impossible. He thus introduces suitably the real purpose of the Law. It is not *able to give life* because (Rom. viii. 3) it is 'weak through the flesh.' *Righteousness:* as in ii. 21. It is the opposite of 'under a curse' in *v.* 10.

The Scripture: or rather 'the portion of Scripture;' see under *v.* 8. It is the literary embodiment of the Law. So suitable here is Dt. xxvii. 26, quoted in *v.* 10, that we cannot but think that to this passage specially Paul refers. *The Scripture* is personified, as in *v.* 8, to enable us to realise its tremendous power. *Shut-up-together:* same word, and a close parallel, in Rom. xi. 32. *All things:* probably 'all men,' cp. Rom. xi. 32; for they only can *sin*. Cp. 1 Cor. i. 27f. The neuter looks upon men in the aggregate as an abstract idea. *Under sin:* Rom. iii. 9: under its curse and penalty and power, and these looked upon as a burden from above pressing all men down. As Paul read Dt. xxvii. 26, the very words of Scripture seemed to bar irresistibly every way of escape from the deadly bondage of sin.

For its words made him powerless to obtain, by anything he could do, the favour of God. See under *v.* 8.

That the promise, etc.: ultimate purpose of the Law in shutting up all things under sin. It expounds, in answer to the question in *v.* 21, the relation of the Law to the promises, looking at these as one whole, as *the promise*. *May-be-given:* i.e. may be fulfilled, which alone remains to be done. So Heb. x. 36, xi. 39. This promise includes virtually (cp. *v.* 14) the Holy Spirit and all the blessings of the New Covenant. *By belief of* the words of *Jesus Christ:* as In ii. 16. It is thrown forward for emphasis. *To them that believe:* emphatic repetition; cp. Rom. iii. 22. Believers are the recipients, and their faith the immediate source, of the blessings. It is conceivable that even believers might receive them from some other source, e.g. observance of ritual.

The question in *v.* 19 is now answered. God gave a law which was powerless to save inasmuch as men were unable to obey it, a law which pronounced a curse upon all who did not obey it, in order to force men to seek and to obtain, by simple belief, the blessings promised by God to Abraham. Consequently, the Law is not 'against,' but subservient to, 'the promises of God.' A practical outworking of this divine purpose in the spiritual life of Paul is recorded in ch. ii. 16.

23. Restatement of *v.* 22, in another form preparing a way for § 14. *Faith* (literally *the faith*) *came*, when belief of the good tidings of salvation proclaimed by Christ entered into the hearts of men. For then *faith*, i.e. assurance that God will fulfil His word, assumed in their thought a new and definite form as the abiding channel of spiritual life. Hence practically *faith came* when the Gospel came. But the argument suggests the former expression as the more suitable note of time. *Kept-in-ward:* 2 Cor. xi. 32, Ph. iv. 7, 1 Pet. i. 5: a military term denoting both the closing of all way of escape and protection against enemies. *Under law:* the abstract principle of treating men according to their actions, (hence no article,) looked upon as an irresistible power under whose authority Paul and his readers were once held in guard. Doubtless he thought chiefly of the Mosaic Law, in which this principle assumed historic form. But these words are true also of the law (Rom. ii. 15) written on the heart; and therefore include all readers, Jews or Gentiles. *Being-shut-up:* Greek present passive; as though each moment at the bidding of the Law every way of escape was being closed. It defines *kept-in-ward;* and links *v.* 23 to *v.* 22. For, to be shut up under

law, is, since we cannot obey it, to be shut up under sin. Contrast Rom. vi. 14. *For the faith, etc.:* purpose for which every way of escape was each moment closed; and therefore parallel with *v. 22b*. *Revealed:* i. 16: specially appropriate because faith is matter of immediate consciousness; which is implied in this word. See under Rom. i. 17. The Gospel unveiled, not merely the truths therein set forth, but a new conception of confidence in the promises of God. And in order that we may have this conception of faith we were formerly held in prison under the irresistible rule of law.

24. Summing up of § 13, and especially of *vv.* 22, 23. *The Law:* of Moses. But, in less degree, this is true of the law written on the heart. *Tutor*, or *guardian:* 1 Cor. iv. 15: one who takes charge of children under seven years old, usually a slave. Cp. Plato, *Lysis* p. 208*c*: "Who rules thee? This tutor. Indeed, a slave! . . . Strange that one who is free be ruled by a slave! But, what doing, does the tutor rule thee? Leading me to the teacher's house." *For Christ:* purpose for which *the Law has become our tutor*, viz. that, instead of wandering elsewhere, we should come to Christ and belong to Him. That Paul thinks of *Christ*, not as a teacher, as the word *tutor* naturally suggests, but as a means of justification, the following words show. *That we might, etc.:* parallel with *for Christ*, and supplementing it. We were placed in helpless bondage under the iron rule of law, that for us there might be no way of escape except by coming to Christ to *be justified through faith*. Cp. ii. 16.

SECTION 13 is an important addition to the teaching about the Law in Rom. v. 20. See note under Rom. viii. 11. The Law was given in order to reveal to us our utter moral helplessness and ruin, to destroy all hope of self-wrought salvation, and thus to drive us to Christ for help and to prepare us to accept in sheer desperation justification as God's gift on the simple condition of faith. Notice carefully that the immediate moral purpose of the Law to hold men back from sin, which must have been in God's thought when giving it, is by Paul completely subordinated to this ultimate evangelical purpose. To him the Law is only a preparation for the Gospel. This reveals his deep conviction of the powerlessness of mere morality to secure man's highest interests, and of the infinitely greater importance of the new life proclaimed in the Gospel. With Paul, Christian morality is derived (v. 14) from the law of love accomplished in us by (*v.* 16) the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit.

SECTION XIV.

BY FAITH WE ARE, IN CHRIST, HEIRS OF ABRAHAM.

CH. III. 25—29.

But, faith having come, no longer are we under a tutor. 26 *For ye all are sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus.* 27 *For so many of you as have been baptized for Christ have put on Christ.* 28 *There is no Jew nor Greek; there is no servant nor freeman; there is no male and female. For ye all are one person in Christ Jesus.* 29 *But if ye* are *Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.*

In conspicuous contrast to the reign of law before faith came, Paul describes in *vv.* 25—28 his readers' changed position now; and in *v.* 29 their consequent relation to Abraham and to the promise made to him.

25. The change which followed the arrival of faith. *Under a tutor;* links the metaphor of *v.* 24 to the words 'under law' in *v.* 23.

26. Proof of the foregoing statement. *All:* an emphatic breaking down of the distinction (*v.* 28) of Jew and Gentile which the false teachers were so anxious to maintain. Note the change from 'we' and 'our' in *vv.* 23—25, which refer chiefly to Jews who had the Law of Moses, to *ye* in *vv.* 26—29, which embraces Paul's Gentile readers as sharers of the blessings about to be described. *Sons of God:* Rom. viii. 14. Paul's argument assumes that this title is inconsistent with being 'under a tutor.' And, since the word *son* is in itself by no means inconsistent with being under a tutor but rather the reverse, this assumed inconsistency reveals the theological definiteness, in Paul's thought, of the term *sons of God* denoting a relation to God incompatible with bondage to law. See further under ch. iv. 5, 7. This incompatibility, and that this sonship is *through faith*, imply that not all men are in this sense *sons of God*. So always in the New Testament. See my *Romans*, p. 239: cp. Jno. i. 12. *In Christ Jesus;* might be joined to *faith*, as in Eph. i. 15, 1 Tim. iii. 13, 2 Tim. i. 13, iii. 15. But, if so, the addition of these words hardly adds to the sense. And, that they contain a new and independent thought, is suggested by the word Christ, at the end of *v.* 27 and *v.* 28. So the RV. By means of our faith and

in virtue of union with Christ who is the only-begotten Son of God, we are ourselves *sons of God*. Of this great privilege Hosea i. 10, quoted in Rom. ix. 26, is a remarkable prophecy.

27. Proof of the whole statement in *v.* 26: *So-many-as*, covers 'all;' *baptized*, covers 'by faith;' *put-on Christ*, covers 'sons of God in Christ Jesus.' *Baptized for Christ:* the formal and visible gate into the Christian life, designed to lead to a new relation to Christ. See under Rom. vi. 3. *Put-on Christ:* so that the nature and disposition and relations of Christ are like a garment enwrapping us on every side. See under Rom. xiii. 14; and cp. Job xxix. 14, 'I put on righteousness; and it clothed me. Like a robe and turban was my justice.' So ch. viii. 22, xxxix. 19, etc. Objectively, they had already at their baptism put on Christ. For by thus publicly avowing faith in Him they had fulfilled a condition of the blessings of the New Covenant, in order to obtain these blessings; and had thus made them their own. Now the New Covenant makes us sharers of all that Christ has and is. Consequently, since He is Son of God, and the *baptized have put on Christ*, they also 'are sons of God in Christ.' Subjectively, Paul bids his readers (in Rom. xiii. 14) put on Christ, i.e. appropriate to themselves Christ's moral disposition, which was already theirs at baptism by a right given to them in the undeserved favour of God.

This argument implies that all Paul's readers were baptized; and that their baptism was an expression of faith, so that what the baptized possess as such they have obtained by faith. Cp. Col. ii. 12: 'wherein also ye were raised with Him by faith.' Paul thus, as in *vv.* 3—5, courteously assumes the genuineness of their Christian profession, and appeals to their entrance into the Christian life. Any false brethren among them are here left out of account.

Since *vv.* 26, 27 cannot apply to infants, and indeed would hardly have been written had many of Paul's readers been baptized in infancy, it is utterly unfair to infer, from the spiritual significance here attributed to the baptism of believers, that similar spiritual results are wrought in baptized infants. For the baptism of a believer is an outward expression of a great spiritual and personal crisis in his inner life: whereas an infant's personal life has not yet begun. This difference bars all argument from the one to the other. Consequently, this passage and others similar have no bearing on the regeneration of infants in baptism. The inward and spiritual benefits of baptism are, by those

baptized in infancy, obtained actually and personally only when the baptized one claims them by personal faith in, and confession of, Christ, thus joining the company of His professed followers.

28*a*. In the embrace of Christ as the encompassing element of life, fade all earthly distinctions, nationality, social position, and even sex. Similar thought in Col. iii. 11; Rom. x. 12, 1 Cor. xii. 13. The changed form *male and female* marks off this distinction from the others. And we remember that it was earlier than sin. Yet as we come to Christ even sex vanishes: and without distinction men and women of every rank and nationality receive in Him the same spiritual blessings.

Only to sex as affecting our relation to Christ does this assertion apply. It therefore does not absolutely deny the distinction of sex in man's future glory. And, that it belongs to man's original constitution, suggests strongly that even sex will share that glory. We can well conceive that, just as the happiness of many families on earth is increased immensely by the mutual influence of brothers and sisters, so it will be in the great family above. Paul's prohibition (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 1 Tim. ii. 12) to women to speak in the Church proves that in this relation also, in his view, the distinction of sex continues.

28*b*. Broad foundation principle of the foregoing assertions. *All ye:* still more emphatic than the appeal in *v.* 26; recalling the varieties of Paul's readers. *Are one person:* cp. Eph. ii. 15. It makes prominent that our relation to Christ is that of living persons. Contrast 'are one thing' in 1 Cor. iii. 8, xi. 5, Jno. xvii. 11, 21, 22, 23; where personality is left out of sight, and men and even the Father and Son are looked upon merely as abstract objects of thought. *One-person:* not identity, but the strongest description possible of absolute identity of relation; which, in the Father and Son, and in us so far as Christ's purpose is realised, finds its consummation in absolute harmony. *In Christ:* Jno. xvii. 21, 23: i.e. through the objective facts of Jesus, and through spiritual union with Him. This repetition of the last words of *v.* 26 marks the completion of the argument there begun. 'Ye are no longer in bondage: for ye are all sons of God, a position incompatible with bondage: for the life ye entered at baptism is union with Christ, who is Son of God. And in union with Him all earthly distinctions fade.'

29. Leads up the argument of §§ 13, 14 to the chief matter of ch. iii., the promises to Abraham and his seed. *Ye are Christ's:* 1 Cor. iii. 23, xv. 23, Rom. xiv. 8. They who 'have put on Christ'

themselves belong to Him. *Then are ye, etc.:* logical inference. Since all the Galatian Christians are in Christ and are thus in some sense one person, and so belong to Christ and are in some sense a part of Christ; and since (as proved in *vv.* 13—16) the *seed* for which the promise to Abraham was made is coextensive with Christ, Paul infers that his readers also are included in *Abraham's seed*. *Heirs according to promise:* practical significance of the foregoing. What the heritage is, we learn from 'sons of God' in *v.* 26. Cp. Rom. viii. 17. *Promise;* recalls the whole argument of *vv.* 14—29. *According to promise:* the mode and kind of heirship, viz. in virtue of an announcement of coming benefit. Paul has no need to say that he refers to the promises to Abraham. He therefore speaks merely of *promise* in the abstract. The word *heirs* which in Greek closes the verse opens a way for § 15.

In SECTION 14 Paul describes his readers' present position, after describing in § 13 their former state. They are no longer under any kind of restraint, and therefore not under the Law. For, by faith and in virtue of their union with Christ, they enjoy the glorious position of sons of God. For when they entered the Church of Christ they assumed His position and rights. In relation to Him all human relations vanish. For, in Christ, the many members of His Church become only one person. And, since they belong to Him in whom are fulfilled the promises made to Abraham's seed, themselves are heirs on the basis of divine promise.

SECTION XV.

PUPILAGE IS PAST; AND WE HAVE RECEIVED THE SPIRIT OF ADOPTION.

CH. IV. 1—7.

But I say that for so long time as the heir is a child he differs nothing from a servant, though he be Lord of all; [2] *but is under guardians and stewards until the father's predetermined* time. [3] *So also we, when we were children, were under the rudiments of the world, held in bondage.* [4] *But when the fulness of the time came God sent forth His Son, born from woman, born under law, that He might buy off those under law, that we might receive the adoption* of sons. [5] *And*

because ye are sons God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying Abba, Father. 'So that no longer art thou a servant but a son: and, if a son, also an heir through God.

In § 13 Paul taught that by giving the Law God imposed a temporary bondage on those who afterwards became His sons and heirs of Abraham. His justification of this remarkable assertion, He postpones to § 15; eager to describe at once, in § 14, for the sake of contrast, his reader's subsequent and present position of honour. That this previous temporary bondage is not inconsistent with their present position, he shows in ch. iv. 1—3; and in *vv.* 4—7 supplements his description in § 14 of this position by recording the two great events which have brought about the change. Thus *vv.* 1—3 are parallel to § 13; *vv.* 4—7, to § 14. To the preliminary description of men under the guardianship of law, the word 'heirs,' which concluded § 14, is a convenient stepping stone.

1. *But I say;* introduces a new point, as in v. 16, iii. 17. *For so long time as:* exact coextension of time, as in Rom. vii. 1, 1 Cor. vii. 39. *Child:* usually one under ten years old. Same word in 1 Cor. iii. 1, xiii. 11, Eph. iv. 14, Heb. v. 13f, Rom. ii. 20, Mt. xi. 25, Lk. x. 21. *Servant*, or *slave:* see under Rom. i. 1. *Lord:* one having control over men or things, correlative to a *servant* who is under the control of his lord. Cp. Mt. x. 24f. Even if the father was still living *the heir* was in some sense *lord of all*, as already possessing a relation to the father which will some day put the estate under his control. But the contrast between the child's apparent and virtual position is more conspicuous if we conceive the father to be dead. For then the estate has no owner except one who is himself under the control of others. And, that our Father in heaven ever lives, does not exclude this thought. For the analogy is quoted merely to show that outward dependence is consistent with real and great wealth.

2. Further description of the child's position. *Guardians:* literally, men to whose care something or someone is committed. Same word in Mt. xx. 8, Lk. viii. 3. It is a wider term than *stewards*, which denotes (e.g. 1 Cor. iv. 1f, Rom. xvi. 23) one who has charge of the property of another, in this case, that of the heir. This narrower sense of *stewards* suggests that *guardians* refers chiefly to those in charge of the child himself.

Whether in Roman law *the father* could *determine* the *time* when his heir should take possession, is immaterial. For Paul is now passing from the metaphor to its underlying reality. The son, although virtually possessing the whole estate, is under the control of others until a certain fixed time comes. Paul remembers that for us this was *the Father's predetermined* time, i.e. a time fixed by our Father in heaven. Similarly, in English law a father can determine by will at what age his son shall receive from the trustees full control over the inheritance.

3. Application of the foregoing comparison. *Also we:* as well as the heir to an estate. That both Jewish and Geotile readers are included, is made quite certain by *v.* 5 and *vv.* 8, 9. *When we were children:* as implied in the word 'tutor' in iii. 24. It is the point of the foregoing comparison. Virtually it is explained and justified in the following words, which are evidence of spiritual childhood. In another sense, i.e. in contrast to the maturity of heaven, even believers (1 Cor. xiii. 11) are *children.*

Rudiments, or *elements:* primarily, the letters of the alphabet; then the simplest component parts of the material world, as in 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12, Wisdom vii. 17, xix. 17, and especially earth, air, fire, water; then the simplest beginnings of any branch of knowledge, as in Heb. v. 12. If we render *elements*, then *the elements of the world* (so Col. ii. 8, 20) will denote the constituent parts composing the material world around us. But this would give no sense consistent with Paul's teaching. For unbelievers, though in bondage to the material world around them, are in no special bondage to its component parts. Consequently, the inserted word *elements* would be meaningless. It remains therefore that here and in Col. ii. 8, 20 Paul thinks of *rudiments*, i.e. of the simplest beginnings of spiritual education. So Heb. v. 12. And, if so, since *the world* cannot possibly be the entire lesson, of which *the rudiments* are the beginning, these last words must be taken as conveying a complete idea, as in *v.* 9; and *of the world* must denote the matter of which *the rudiments*, these simplest beginnings, consist. The material world, with its various material objects, was the great lesson-book of pictures laid open by the great Father before the eyes of the infant human race, that men might read therein His name, and to some extent His nature and His will concerning them. Even to the heathen God revealed Himself (Rom. i. 20) through the material world; and thus laid a

foundation of moral obligation. And God's revelation to Israel was conveyed through material objects, viz. the holy things of the Old Covenant. For this reason, the worship both of Jews and Gentiles took a material form. And since, by God's design, both heathenism and Judaism were on their better sides a preparation for the Gospel, Paul embraces them here, overlooking for the moment their vast differences, under this one designation. The writings of Greece and Rome reveal some progress in these rudiments of religion. All this is not disproved by Paul's description of idolatry, on its worse side, as (1 Cor. x. 20) a worship of demons and as hostile to the Gospel. For in *v.* 10 even the divinely-ordained Mosaic ritual is treated as apostacy; and frequently those who claimed for it continued validity are denounced in strongest terms. And this we can understand. For they who place above and against the perfect teaching of Christ the rudimentary teaching of material forms pervert into positive error even divinely-given truth.

Since, both in Jews and Gentiles, these rudiments of religion assume the form of law, i.e. of a rule of conduct with rewards and punishments, they were a superior power *under* which in earlier ages our race lay, against which there was no rising up, and from which no escape. *Held-in-bondage:* graphic description, expounding the word *under;* cognate to 'servant' in *v.* 1. It recalls iii. 22. The rudimentary teaching given to Jews and Gentiles in material forms belonging to the world around reveals God's will that we obey Him, and the penalty awaiting disobedience; and, by prompting efforts after obedience, reveals our powerlessness to obey, and the presence of a power hostile to God forcing us to sin and from which we cannot free ourselves. Hence all who have only this rudimentary teaching are *held-in-bondage:* for they cannot do what their best judgment approves. This idea of *bondage* will be more fully developed in § 18.

That, in contrast to the saved, the unsaved are here called *children*, and that they are placed by 'the Father' under a tutor, implies that they stand in special relation to Him, and indeed in some sense are already His sons. For it is a man's own sons whom he puts under a tutor. This relation of all men to God rests upon their creation and the death of Christ for all men. We must therefore not think that our faith evokes God's paternal love to us. That love rested on us before time began; and manifested itself in the death of Christ for us even when we were sinners. Yet, in the New Testament, believers and no

others are called (iii. 26, Rom. viii. 14; Jno. i. 12) sons of God. This limitation was probably designed to warn us that they who reject Christ are in a real sense, and unless saved by faith will be in every sense, outside the family of God.

4—7. Two facts, one (*v.* 4f) historical and one (*v.* 6) spiritual, which have put an end to the pupilage and bondage just described and brought about (*v.* 7) the happy state depicted in § 14.

4. The word rendered *time*, (same word in *v.* 1,) which differs from that in Eph. i. 10, suggests the long delay of Christ's coming. *The fulness of the time:* as though a long space were marked out to be filled up by successive moments. Cp. Mk. i. 15, Lk. xxi. 24, Jno. vii. 8, Gen. xxix. 21. It was 'the Father's predetermined time.' On what principles this space of time was marked out, Paul does not say. But doubtless the purpose of the delay was that the Law written on the hearts of men and on the tables of stone might have full scope, and thus prove itself powerless to save and in this way reveal man's helpless bondage under sin; and that human nature might have time and opportunity to put forth all its powers, under the influence of law more or less fully understood, and thus find out its inability to attain for itself happiness. When Christ came, the civilisation and religious teaching of the ancient world were utterly worn out; and in spite of them society was rapidly sinking into ruin.

Sent forth; recalls the surroundings from the midst of which, and away from which, Christ came to earth. *His Son:* as in Rom. i. 3, viii. 3. That this title is used here as a sufficient designation of Christ, implies that it belongs to Him in a unique sense, i.e. that He holds a relation to the Father shared by none else. See my *Romans* Diss. i. 7. And, since this august title is evidently chosen to mark the dignity of Him whom *God sent forth*, it implies the pre-existence of Christ. This proof is not invalidated by Jno. i. 6, which certainly does not imply the pre-existence of John: for these very different words are fully accounted for by John's designation from birth for a special office: cp. Lk. i. 15, Jer. i. 5. *Born from woman:* bodily derivation of the earthly life into which *God sent His Son*. It is similar to, but wider than, Rom. i. 3: see notes. *Under law:* iv. 21, v. 18, Rom. vi. 14, 1 Cor. ix. 20. Christ entered by birth a state of subjection to a prescribed rule of conduct. By being born a Jew, He took upon Himself the obligation to keep, in every sense, the Law of Moses; and accepted obedience to law as the condition of the approval of God.

5. Purpose for which Christ was born under obligation to keep law. *Those under law*, the Jews. A close verbal and real parallel is in 1 Cor. ix. 20, where a servant imitates His Master. In a wider yet correct sense all men are under law. For all are subject (Rom. ii. 14) to a rule of conduct by which they will be judged. Actually, those under obligation to keep the Law are also under its curse. For, all men have broken the Law. From this curse, Christ came to *buy* us *off*, (same word in iii. 13,) by Himself enduring it. This purpose implies that Christ's assumed obligation to keep the Law, and therefore His perfect obedience, were needful for man's deliverance from the penalty of sin, i.e. needful to reconcile (Rom. iii. 26) his deliverance with God's justice. It thus involves the active obedience of Christ as an essential element of man's salvation. But this element Paul does not make prominent. He attributes salvation, always to the death, never to the obedient life, of Christ.

The adoption: literally *the son-making*, the act in which God makes us His sons. See my *Romans* p. 238. *Receive;* reminds us that this act of God is an enrichment to us. *We:* not emphatic, yet reminding us that *the adoption* is for both born Jews and Paul's Gentile readers. This further purpose implies that only those bought off from the curse of the Law can *receive the adoption*, i.e. that this curse excludes from the family of God. It gives also the ultimate object of the mission of the Son, which is not negative, i.e. to save us from death, but positive, i.e. to bring us to God. In order that we might enter His family, God sent His Son to liberate us, at the cost of His own life, from the penalty of the broken Law. Cp. iii. 13, 14.

6. A spiritual event in the hearts of Paul's readers analogous to, and consequent upon, the above historical event. *Ye are sons:* as already stated in iii. 26. This implies that the purpose of the sending of the Son, stated in *v.* 5, has been actually accomplished. And, *because* to be *sons* of God and yet not have *the Spirit of His Son* would be incongruous, *God sent-forth, etc.* Notice the stately parallel of *vv.* 4 and 6: cp. Rom. i. 3, 4. *The Spirit of His Son:* so 'Spirit of Christ;' Rom. viii. 9, 1 Pet. i. 11. An uncommon term, yet easily understood. For, that the Spirit is sent both by (Jno. xiv. 26, xv. 26) the Son and the Father, suggests His similar relation to the Father and the Son. And the analogy of our own spirit in 1 Cor. ii. 11 suggests that the Son, like the Father, sends forth, in the person of the Holy Spirit, the animating principle of His own divine

life to be the animating principle of His servants' life. Thus the presence of the Spirit is virtually the presence of Christ Himself within us: Rom. viii. 9f, Eph. iii. 17, Jno. xiv. 18. That this animating principle is a Person distinct from the Son and the Father, (see under 1 Cor. xii. 11,) belongs to the mystery of the Holy Trinity. *Sent-forth:* or *has-sent-forth.* The Greek tense does not suggest, as does the English preterite, some definite time, e.g. Pentecost. By personal faith (iii. 26) Paul's readers became *sons* of God; and, *because* of this, received *the Spirit of His Son.* The Spirit, thus received, works a new birth: Jno. iii. 5. Consequently, the recipients are born from God: 1 Jno. iii. 9, v. 1, 18, Jas. i. 18; cp. 1 Pet. i. 23. But of this new birth Paul speaks only in the casual reference in Tit. iii. 5. He attributes the new life directly to the presence and activity of the Spirit: v. 16ff. Since the Spirit is the source of this *cry,* He is said Himself to cry: cp. Rom. viii. 26. So do evil spirits, in Mt. viii. 31. Since men are the mouthpiece of the cry, it is also attributed to them: 'in whom we cry,' Rom. viii. 15. *Abba, Father:* see under Rom. viii. 15. The Eternal Son, as He looks at God, cries *Father.* This cry the Spirit of the Son, sent forth by God, puts into the hearts of His people. And, while they utter it, they are conscious that their own cry is the voice in them of the Spirit of the Son of God. This inward voice is thus a proof to them that they are sons of God. See under Rom. viii. 17.

7. Logical result of *v.* 6. *No longer:* in contrast to *v.* 3. Although, as doing the work of God, we are (see under Rom. i. 1) His servants, yet the word *servant* is *no longer* an accurate description of our position. The servant has become an adopted *son.* And, to be *a son,* is to be *also an heir.* In Roman law the adopted sons of an intestate father shared his property equally with the born sons. And they who believe in Christ will enjoy for ever, in virtue of their relation to God, His infinite wealth. So Rom. viii. 17. *Through God,* or *by the agency of God:* cp. i. 1, 'through God, the Father, who raised, etc.:' and see notes. By sending His Son that we might receive the adoption, and by sending the Spirit of His Son to assure us of this, God is not only the ultimate source but Himself an immediate agent of our heirship.

The apparent contradiction between *no longer a servant* and Rom. i. 1, 1 Cor. vii. 22 results from the weakness of human language to set forth the many-sided truths of God; and warns

us to use the utmost caution in interpreting solitary statements in the Bible. Neglect of this has given rise to innumerable and serious errors. Fortunately the chief doctrines of the New Testament are stated so frequently that, as here, one statement supplies the imperfection of another.

SECTION 15 completes Paul's teaching about the sons of God, teaching very conspicuous in Romans and Galatians but elsewhere rare (2 Cor. vi. 18, Eph. i. 5, Ph. ii. 15) with Paul. It is very similar to Jno. i. 12, 1 Jno. iii. 1f, and akin to Christ's words in Mt. v. 45, Lk. xx. 36, and to His frequent teaching that God is our Father. We are said to be His children, not by creation but by adoption through faith into His family. Before our faith we were in bondage. But this is not inconsistent with our present relation to God. For even a born son is, during his minority, in the position of a servant. To us now these days of servitude are past. So important in the eyes of God was our new relation to Him that to bring it about He sent forth from the glories of heaven His Eternal Son. And, to make the adopted sons like the Firstborn and to set an inward seal upon their adoption, God sent forth into their hearts the Spirit of His Son. So that now, by the immediate agency of God, we are His sons and heirs of His wealth.

SECTION XVI.

THEN TURN NOT BACK TO THINGS LEFT BEHIND.

CH. IV. 8—11.

Nevertheless at that time, not knowing God, ye were in bondage to those who by nature are not gods. [9] *But now, having come to know God, or rather having become known by God, how are ye turning again to the weak and poor rudiments to which, beginning anew, ye wish to be again in bondage?* [10] *Days ye observe, and months, and seasons, and years.* [11] *I fear you, lest in any way I have in vain laboured for you.*

Practical and personal application to the Galatian Christians, closing the argument introduced in iii. 1.

8, 9. Startling and sad contrast to *v.* 7. The contrast is to be sought, not in the bygone detail *ye were servants*, but in *turning back again to the rudiments*, which is the chief matter of § 16 and indeed (i. 6, iv. 21, v. 4) of the whole Epistle, and which was actually going on as Paul wrote, in almost tragic contrast to *v.* 7. Paul might have said 'nevertheless ye are turning back:' but, as his manner (e.g. Rom. vi. 17, viii. 15) was, he preludes his chief point by other matter which throws it into stronger relief. Then, after the interval thus caused, instead of an assertion, he puts in *v.* 9 his chief point in the form of an astonished question. *Not knowing God:* 1 Th. iv. 5, Jno. xvii. 25; contrast Rom. i. 21. In each case the extent of the knowledge is determined by the context. The personal God who revealed Himself to Israel (Ps. lxxvi. 1) was not known, in the same sense, to the heathen. Yet they derived from Nature such knowledge of Him as should have prompted further search, and actually left them without excuse. On the other hand, only they who believe the Gospel, and in proportion to their faith, know God so as to rest and rejoice in Him. Cp. Jno. xvii. 3. The heathens' scantier opportunities of knowing God, as compared with the Jews', were a palliation of their service of idols: but this palliation *at that time* aggravates by its absence *now* the guilt of turning back to *the* old *rudiments* of heathenism. *Were-in-bondage* or *were-servants:* same word in iv. 25, v. 13; Rom. vi. 6, vii. 6, 25, Eph. vi. 7. It involves the two ideas of doing work (cp. v. 13) for others and of being (cp. iv. 25) under others' control. By performing the ritual of idolatry, the heathen acknowledged themselves to be servants under the control of their supposed deities. And whether idols be looked upon as mere images or as demons, idolatry is service and bondage to objects which *by nature*, i.e. by their mode of existence, *are no gods*. The word *nature* (see under Rom. ii. 14) suggests the essential and infinite difference between *God* and the *no-gods*.

9. *But now;* a marked feature of Paul's phraseology and thought, the contrast of past and present; see under Rom. vi. 22. *Having-come-to-know God:* as implied in *v.* 6. *Known by God:* see under 1 Cor. viii. 3. Paul remembers that the change has its ultimate source, not in the mind of man as though by his intelligence he had found out God, but in the mind of God who in mercy has looked upon man. Therefore, leaving out of sight for a moment God's eternal knowledge of all men, which lay at that time outside his readers' thought,

Paul speaks here as though they had lately come within the embrace of this divine knowledge. They can now say, as once they never said, 'God knows me.' *How?* as in ii. 14: 'by what process is so remarkable a retrogression taking place?' *Are turning:* the apostacy now going on, and therefore not yet complete. See under i. 6. Same word in 2 Cor. iii. 16, 1 Th. i. 9: often used of turning to God, here the opposite. *Again;* recalls *v.* 3. *Weak:* unable to achieve results. *Poor:* unable to enrich. *Again . . . again:* emphatic reference to *v.* 3, reminding us that to go to the Law for salvation was to go again to something already tried and found unable to save. *Beginning-anew:* as though recommencing the severe discipline of their spiritual childhood. *To-be-in-bondage:* as in *v.* 8. Cp. v. 1. Since to seek salvation from law is essentially bondage, (for it is a vain effort to free ourselves from a terrible curse,) all desire for the Law as a means of salvation is practically a *wish to be again in bondage to* it. Cp. Acts xv. 10. And this practical result of the present conduct of the Galatian Christians reveals its folly. They deliberately prefer *now* a path already tried, for which the only excuse 'at that time' was their then ignorance of God.

Paul assumes that both himself (*v.* 3) and his Gentile readers (*vv.* 8, 9) were formerly under the same *rudiments*, and in *bondage* to them. This implies, not only that Judaism was powerless to save and to enrich, but that heathenism, as well as Judaism, was in some sense and measure a preparation for the Gospel. Heathen sages taught the great principles of right and wrong, and that God's favour was to be obtained only by doing right: and even the rites of heathenism, deeply corrupt as many of them were, contained elements expressive of man's felt need of salvation and of God. In other words, the Old Covenant did but reveal, with greater distinctness and depth and certainty, truths already revealed, in Nature and in the law written on the heart, to the nations around; and added to these moral truths a prophecy of future salvation of which only the faintest outline was known to the heathen world. Consequently, to seek salvation by the Mosaic Covenant of works, was to go back, ignoring the noblest element in the earlier revelation, e.g. Gen. xv. 6, Hab. ii. 4, Jer. xxxi. 31ff, Ezek. xxxvi. 25ff, to that which in a lower degree heathenism had in common with Judaism, to that which both Jews and Gentiles had found unable to save them. That the Law is here called *weak and poor*

(cp. Rom. viii. 3) does not deny its infinite worth as a means (iii. 24) of leading men to Christ. Cp. Rom. vii. 12. It is good as a stepping stone to the Gospel; but is utterly ruinous when chosen as a means of salvation in preference to the salvation proclaimed in the Gospel.

This assumption that to go to the Mosaic Law for salvation was a return to the moral powerlessness and poverty of heathenism, although perfectly true and embodying a principle of immense importance, helps to explain the intense hatred of the Jews to a teacher of Jewish race who used such words.

10. Simple statement of fact. It explains and justifies the charge involved in the question of *v.* 9. *Days:* cp. Rom. xiv. 5: the weekly Sabbath; but including probably the great days (Jno. vii. 37, xix. 31) of the yearly festivals. Cp. Col. ii. 16; where, in the inverse order of frequency, we have the weekly sabbath indisputably, the beginnings of months, and the yearly 'feasts.' It is thrown conspicuously forward to the beginning of *v.* 10, suggesting that these sacred *days* were a chief feature of the Jewish ritual adopted by the Galatian Christians. *Observe:* attend to them with scrupulous care. Same word in Josephus, *Antiq.* bk. iii. 5. 5, "to observe the seventh days;" in reference to the fourth commandment. *Months:* probably the new moons, which are constantly mentioned with the weekly Sabbath; Num. xxviii. 11, Isa. i. 13, Hosea ii. 11, 1 Chr. xxiii. 31, also Num. x. 10, Ps. lxxxi. 3. Philo speaks (vol. ii. 286) of the seventh month as specially honoured by containing "the greatest of feasts." But he says this chiefly to glorify the number seven. Moreover, this long festival is included in the *seasons:* and the new moons, a conspicuous feature of Jewish ritual, are unmentioned unless referred to as *months*. That only the beginnings of the *months*, but the whole of the *days* and *seasons*, were sacred, is an unimportant difference. *Seasons:* same word in Lev. xxiii. 4, introducing regulations for the Passover, Pentecost, and feast of Tabernacles. And to these feasts occupying several days, Paul probably refers here. *Years:* the seventh Sabbatic year. The plural number, making the reference general, forbids us to infer that Paul wrote during a sacred year. He merely says that, to observe the year when it came round, was part of his readers' Judaizing programme.

11. Result, in Paul's heart, of the conduct described in *v.* 10. His own converts were objects filling him with *fear*. For, their present conduct threatened to render fruitless his toil for them;

and thus to inflict upon him, eager for success, i.e. for their salvation, a severe blow. He was therefore in some sense at their mercy. This *fear* reveals their tremendous danger and Paul's deep interest in them. *In-any-way:* as in ii. 2, 1 Th. iii. 5. He thinks of the variety of ways in which his labours may become fruitless. The emphatic word is *in-vain:* cp. iii. 4. For the result is still contingent; whereas Paul's labours are already matter of fact, and therefore beyond reach of fear. [This explains sufficiently the perfect indicative, without supposing that Paul assumes that his fear is already realised.]

VERSE 10 is Paul's first plain statement of the nature of the incipient apostacy from which in this Epistle he seeks to recall his readers. Observance of the Jewish festivals and even of the Jewish Sabbath, though all these were ordained by God, is described as a turning back to the powerless rudiments of spiritual education and as a desire to return to bondage, and is said to inspire in Paul fear lest his labours for them be in vain. This reveals the vast issues at stake in this observance, and its tremendous significance. Evidently it implied that the Law of Moses was still binding as a condition, and therefore the only means of obtaining, the blessings of the New Covenant. This inference from the observance of Jewish ritual is plainly stated in ch. v. 3. Cp. Acts xv. 1, 5. It explains the question in iii. 2, and the argument following; and is the only conceivable explanation of them.

This logical inference from these Jewish practices would produce various results in various persons. Since the Law contains moral precepts involving broad principles which reach to the inmost sources of human action, and thus reveals a morality far beyond reach of the best men who come to the Law for salvation, the result to earnest seekers would be a sense of condemnation deepening into despair. Of this, Paul had himself been an example: cp. Rom. vii. 24. Others would direct and limit their attention to those parts of the Law which seemed easy of fulfilment, especially the details of its ritual, e.g. observance of sacred days. And on such observance they would rely for the favour of God, silencing the voice of conscience by increased punctiliousness in small details. Of this false reliance a lowered moral tone is an inevitable result. In each case the result would be subversive of the Gospel and of Christianity. Yet these sacred days were ordained by God, in order to prepare a way, both as means of spiritual education and by their self-inability to save, for

the salvation revealed by Christ. To retrace our steps in the path of life, is the way to destruction.

In Acts xxi. 24 we find Paul himself doing that which in the Galatian Christians caused him so much fear. See Diss. i. 5. As a born Jew, to conciliate Jews and to avoid appearance of denying the divine origin of the Mosaic Law, Paul himself obeyed its requirements. But he taught strenuously that such observance was not needful for salvation, or in any way binding on Gentile converts. Thus Paul's conduct and teaching were consistent, although easily misunderstood and misrepresented.

REVIEW of §§ 9—16, the central argument of the Epistle.

Some men in Galatia had taught that Christians are bound to be circumcised and to keep Jewish sacred seasons. Without discussing these details, Paul goes at once to a broad and erroneous principle underlying them, viz. that observance of the Law is still a condition of the favour of God. In disproof of this, he appeals to his readers' earlier Christian life which was derived, as memory testifies, not from obedience to law but from belief of a preached word. He asks whether a life begun by reception of the Spirit is to be perfected by ordinances pertaining to mere bodily life. With his readers' experience agrees the story of Abraham, who obtained by faith blessings for himself and promises for all nations. These promises are fulfilled in those who believe the Gospel, and in them only. For, on all who come to it for salvation the Law pronounces a curse. From this curse Christ bought us off, by Himself undergoing it, that by faith we might obtain the blessings promised to Abraham. If the Law be a condition of salvation, God has nullified His promises to Abraham by adding to them a later and impossible condition; which even human morality forbids. Paul notices incidentally that the heirs of the promises are uniformly designated by a word in the singular number, in close harmony with the fulfilment of these promises in Christ. The real purpose of the Law was to create in man consciousness of helpless bondage under the power of sin, in order to compel him to seek salvation by faith in Christ. The days of bondage are now past. By union with Christ we are sons of God, a relation in which all human distinctions fade; and heirs of Abraham's promises. The former days were the bondage of childhood: but now that the set time has come we are adopted sons of God; and, in token of this, God has put in our hearts the filial cry of His Firstborn Son. In view of all this, Paul asks why his readers wish to begin

over again the discipline and bondage of their earlier days, and expresses a fear lest they will rob him of the fruits of his toil on their behalf.

THE weekly SABBATH is, as we have seen, included, and probably referred to specially, in the evidently sad statement of Gal. iv. 10. This agrees with Col. ii. 16, where the 'Sabbath,' which must be chiefly the weekly rest, is joined to feasts and new moons and distinctions of food as a matter in which sentence must not be pronounced upon Christians; and with Rom. xiv. 5, where the superiority of one day above another is left an open question. The relation therefore of the Jewish Sabbath to Christianity demands our attention.

The word *Sabbath* is an English form of a Hebrew word denoting always a sacred rest. The corresponding verb denotes sometimes simply to cease or rest, as in Gen. viii. 22, Josh. v. 12, Jer. xxxi. 36, Prov. xxii. 10, Job xxxii. 1, Neh. vi. 3; and sometimes to keep a sacred rest, as in Gen. ii. 2 'and He kept Sabbath on the seventh day from all His work which He did,' Ex. xvi. 30, xxiii. 12, xxxiv. 21, Lev. xxiii. 32, xxv. 2.

Although there are several festal days in which 'servile work' was forbidden, e.g. Lev. xxiii. 7f, and in a few places, e.g. *vv.* 11, 15, these seem to be called Sabbaths or are indisputably called (so *v.* 24) by the cognate name Shabbathôn, yet the weekly Sabbath and the Day of Atonement are raised above all other days as (*vv.* 3, 31f) a cessation from all work and are designated by a special superlative name 'Sabbath of Sabbath-keeping' or 'Rest of Resting,' in AV. 'Sabbath of Rest.' When not otherwise defined, the word *Sabbath* is a sufficient and frequent designation of the weekly rest. Thus the usage of words gives to the seventh day a unique place of honour among the many sacred days of the Law of Moses.

Amid many other ordinances, the weekly Sabbath is very conspicuous as being the special sign of the Mosaic Covenant: Ex. xxxi. 12—17; cp. Ezek. xx. 12. It thus takes in some sense the place of circumcision (Gen. xvii. 10—14) in the covenant with Abraham. The frequent and regular recurrence of the weekly rest made it a very appropriate test and visible expression of loyalty to the covenant with God.

Still further is the weekly Sabbath raised above all other ritual prescriptions by its place in the Decalogue, among commandments valid every one for all time and all men; and by being

based in the Decalogue and in Gen. ii. 3, Ex. xxxi. 17 upon God's work in creation. Of the close relation of the Sabbath to moral precepts, Isa. lvi. 1—6 affords remarkable proof.

That the weekly rest was ordained before Moses, is not proved by Gen. ii. 3: for even after a lapse of time an institution may have been ordained to commemorate a bygone event. Against this, the consecutive order of Gen. ii. cannot be appealed to: for after the ordinance of the Sabbath in *v.* 3 we have in *v.* 7 the creation of man. Nor is it disproved by Ezek. xx. 12: for an already existing institution might at the Exodus have been made by God a sign of the new covenant then given to Israel. That the princes of Israel in the wilderness (Ex. xvi. 22) did not understand the double supply of manna, suggests perhaps that the Sabbath was not then known to them. On the other hand, Gen. viii. 10, 12 and xxix. 27 suggest that a period of seven days was already used as a division of time: and, although this does not imply a weekly day of sacred rest, the division of time into weeks is much more easy to understand if the weeks were separated by a sacred day. The word *remember* in Ex. xx. 8, if it is anything more than an emphatic form of the parallel phrase 'keep the Sabbath day' in Dt. iv. 12, refers doubtless to the institution of the Sabbath in Ex. xvi. 29, 30. Certainly it is no proof or suggestion that the Sabbath was ordained earlier than the departure from Egypt. Indeed, taken together, the above casual and uncertain notes have little weight as evidence either that the Sabbath was not, or was, ordained earlier than the Exodus. But the double supply of manna on the sixth day with no manna on the seventh, and the solemn ordinance of the Sabbath in Ex. xvi. 25—30 before the giving of the Decalogue, are additional marks of honour to the weekly Day of Rest.

The week itself was unknown to the early Greeks and Romans, and apparently to the heathen world generally. But that something like it was known to the Babylonians and Assyrians, is proved by a Babylonian calendar for a sacred month written in the Assyrian language, in which amid sacrifices for other days, the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th days have a uniform description as "days unlawful to work on," and the king is forbidden to eat his ordinary food or change his dress or do his ordinary royal duties on them. See Smith's *Chaldæan Account of Genesis* p. 89; *Records of the Past*, vol. vii. p. 159; Schrader, *Keilinschriften und A. T.* 2nd ed. p. 18. Since these were days of a lunar month, which contains 29½ days, they would not

coincide with the Jewish Sabbath, which is each seventh day all the year round independently of the moon. But the similarity is worthy of notice. An Assyrian form of the word *Sabbath* has been found; (see *Records of the Past*, vol. vii. p. 157;) and is explained as "day of rest of heart." But it is not used in the calendar mentioned above. Other Babylonian inscriptions reveal the sacredness of the number seven.

A seven-fold division of time is also mentioned in the Indian Vedas. So Rig-veda i. 50, in a hymn to the Sun-god: "Clear-sighted god of day, thy seven ruddy mares bear on thy rushing car. With these thy self-yoked steeds, seven daughters of thy chariot, onward thou dost advance." Also Atharva-veda xix. 53, in a hymn to Time: "Time, like a brilliant steed with seven rays. . . . Time, like a seven-wheeled, seven-naved car, moves on." But I learn from a reliable authority that these are the only references to a seven-fold division of time in Indian literature earlier than our era; and that there is no reference there to a weekly rest. But in later days the week became known in India.

Similar scanty references are found in the literature of China.

Dion Cassius (*Roman History* bk. 37. 16—18) states that in his day the division of time into weeks was universal, though not of early date among the Greeks and Romans, and that they received it from the Egyptians. But we have not, so far as I know, any reliable traces of a weekly day of rest among the Egyptians. And indeed the evidence of a weekly division of time earlier than the Christian era and outside Israel is at present very scanty and somewhat uncertain.

The early Christian writers assume that the Sabbath did not exist before Moses. So Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho* ch. 19) says in argument with a Jew, referring to Adam, Abel, Enoch, and Melchizedec: "All these were just men and righteous in the sight of God without even keeping the Sabbath." And Irenæus in his work *Against Heresies* (bk. iv. 16. 2) writes: "Without circumcision and without observance of the Sabbath Abraham believed God and it was reckoned to him for righteousness." Probably these quotations represent the opinion of the Apostolic Church. But the distance of time and absence of independent sources of information deprive this opinion of any critical value as evidence of the date of the first institution of the weekly rest.

The above casual references leave us unable to determine with

confidence whether the Sabbath was earlier than the Mosaic Covenant. And the matter is unimportant. For, that the Jewish Sabbath rested on a basis broader than the Mosaic Covenant, is proved by its connection with God's work at the Creation.

The importance of the Sabbath in the Old Covenant is attested by Jer. xvii. 21—27, Ezek. xx. 12, Neh. x. 31, xiii. 15—22. Its worth in the eyes of the more pious of the later Jews is seen in 1 Macc. i 39, ii. 34, 38, 41.

Yet that which to Israel of the Old Covenant was an obligatory mark of loyalty to God, was, in the Gentile Christians of Galatia, called by Paul a return to spiritual bondage. Indeed the prominent position in *v.* 10 of the word 'days' suggests that their observance of the weekly Sabbath was a chief mark of their apostacy. And this, Paul's foregoing argument enables us to understand. For it implies that the Galatian Christians kept the Jewish Sabbath as an essential condition of salvation. But this was an acknowledgment that the Mosaic Law is still binding as a condition of the favour of God. For the entire Law, including ritual and moral commands, was given by the same authority. Now Paul has proved that the Law pronounces a universal curse, and excludes from the blessings promised to Abraham all those under its domain. Consequently, the continued validity of the Law would close to all men the way of salvation. And this was involved in the observance by the Galatians of the Jewish Sabbath. This observance was therefore utterly subversive of the Gospel proclaimed by Christ. Hence Paul's fear lest his labours in Galatia be in vain.

All this implies that, like the distinction of food, (Mk. vii. 15, 18, Acts x. 15,) so marked a feature of the Mosaic Covenant, also the command to keep sacred the seventh day was in some sense annulled by Christ, and that the great principle of Rom. vi. 14, 1 Cor. ix. 20, that we are 'not under law but under grace,' includes the Sabbath Law. This inference compels us to consider now the relation of the Lord's day to the Jewish Sabbath.

In marked contrast to the comparative disregard of the day so highly honoured in the Old Covenant, we find in the New Testament special honour paid to another day. On the day following the Jewish Sabbath Christ rose from the dead; and on the evening of the same day (Jno. xx. 19) appeared to the assembled disciples. On the same day of the next week He appeared to them again. And on the same day six weeks later

He founded His Church by pouring upon the assembled disciples the Holy Spirit. The infinite importance of these events gives to the first day of the week a glory never conferred on the seventh day.

Accordingly we find in Acts xx. 7 a Christian meeting held on the first day of the week; and in 1 Cor. xvi. 2 Paul prescribes it as the day for laying by money for a charitable purpose. In Rev. i. 10, we read of the Lord's Day, which is honoured by a special revelation to John. And the distinction already given to the first day of the week makes us quite certain that this was the Lord's Day.

All this is confirmed by early Christian writers. The lately discovered *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, written probably early in the second century, says in ch. 14: "Each Lord's Day come together and break bread and give thanks," i.e. celebrate the Eucharist. So the Epistle of Barnabas, probably a few years later, ch. 15, where after a long reference to the Sabbath we read: "For which cause also we keep the eighth day for gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead." Justin writes in the middle of the century, *First Apology* ch. 67: "On what is called Sunday there is a coming together to one place of all who dwell in town or country, and the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read;" and says that this is followed by exhortation and the Lord's Supper, adding: "On Sunday we all make our common gathering since it is the first day in which God changed darkness and crude matter and made the world: and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead." A succession of later writers removes all doubt that the first day of the week was called the Lord's Day, and was a special day of worship in the early Church.

We have already seen that unique honour to one day of the week was a marked feature of the Old Covenant; and that, by its reference to the work of Creation and its place in the Decalogue, the Jewish Sabbath was placed on a basis broader than the Mosaic Law. We now find in the New Covenant still more conspicuous honour paid to one day of the week; but not to the same day. The change of day marks a transition from the Old Covenant to the New. And the honour paid in each covenant to one day in seven suggests that a common element underlies both, and that the Lord's Day bears to the Jewish Sabbath a relation similar to that of the New Covenant to the Old. That this is actually the case, is, I think, fully proved by the following considerations.

We find by experience that the weekly day of rest is of incalculable and many-sided benefit. The gain to the body of regular intervals of rest from the monotonous toil of daily life can never be estimated. Still more valuable is the leisure thus obtained, amid the imperious demands of the present life, for contemplation of the eternal realities of the life to come. Moreover, the observance of this sacred rest in spite of these pressing cares is an acknowledgment, in view of many who through forgetfulness of God are slaves of the world around, of the greater importance of the world above us. Thus, like the Lord's Supper, the Lord's Day gives visible form to the service of God. Moreover, the observance by all Christians of the same day of rest renders united worship possible; and makes the outward aspect of society a recognition of God. For these reasons, (and they might be multiplied indefinitely and they have much more force than appears on the surface,) were there no divine obligation it would be expedient for our highest interests to keep a frequent and regularly recurring day of rest, and that all Christians should observe the same day. This reveals the gain actually derived from the prevalent belief, whatever be its grounds, that the day of rest was ordained by God. Indeed, it is not easy to conceive how otherwise all Christians would agree to keep the same day. Consequently, either this belief is correct or an error has been to the world a manifold and incalculable benefit. This benefit is an element of good in the Jewish Sabbath suitable to all nations and all ages.

These spiritual gains go a long way to prove, or rather strongly confirm our other abundant proof of, the divine origin of the Mosaic Covenant. Certainly, the teacher who gave to his nation an institution so rich in blessing for all mankind was indeed taught by God.

Admitting now the divine origin of the Jewish Sabbath, as we are compelled to do unless we reject the plain and repeated historical statements of the Old Testament, and observing the immense gain to all men of a weekly day of sacred rest, we are irresistibly driven to infer that the rest ordained at Sinai was designed for all mankind; or, in other words, that this gain is by divine purpose. While enjoying the benefits of the Lord's Day, we feel that these benefits are God's gift. And this wider purpose of Israel's Day of Rest is the easiest explanation of its place in the Decalogue and of its reference there to the Creation of the World. Indeed we can well conceive that the great benefit

it was designed to confer on Israel and on the world moved God to select the Sabbath, whether previously existing or not, as the special sign of the Mosaic Covenant. For, by thus selecting it, He gave it a sure place in the national life.

If the above inference and explanation be correct, by keeping the Lord's Day we are doing the will of God and are receiving benefits designed by Him for us. To neglect it, would be to trample under foot a precious and divine gift. We therefore keep it, not as a condition or means of the favour of God or under fear of penalty, but with gratitude for so great a gift and desirous to obtain all the blessings it is designed to convey. And this desire will determine our mode of spending the Sacred Day.

In the above discussion we have left out of sight the symbolic significance which belongs to the Sabbath in common with the entire Mosaic ritual. This significance is embodied in the words 'holy' and 'sanctify,' which are everywhere given to every part of that ritual. God claimed from Israel for Himself one tribe out of twelve, one day in seven, and one-tenth of all produce, in order to assert His universal ownership. He now claims, in the New Covenant, that every man be His servant and priest, that all our possessions be consecrated to Him, and every day and hour be spent for Him. To us, therefore, in the highest conceivable sense every day is holy to the Lord. But this by no means lessens the benefit of separating, from the secular toil which forms so large a part of the work God has allotted to most of us, a portion of time for meditation and evangelical work. This separation of a part greatly aids us to spend our whole time for God.

We understand now the relation to Christianity of the Jewish Sabbath. Whenever instituted, it was commanded in the Law; and was made a sign, and a conspicuous feature, of the Old Covenant of works. Consequently, as commanded by God, it was binding on every Israelite under pain of God's displeasure. And they who sought salvation by law sought it in part by strict observance of the Sabbath. This is the legal aspect of the Jewish Sabbath. Again, like the entire Mosaic ritual, the Sabbath was a symbol of the Christian life. In these two aspects, the legal and the symbolic, the Jewish Sabbath has passed away; or rather has attained its goal in the fuller revelation of the New Covenant. Instead of one day sanctified for Jehovah, every day is now spent for Christ. The Law has led us to Christ. And

the Voice which once condemned us for past disobedience, and made the favour of God impossible by reason of our powerlessness to obey in the future, has been silenced by the Voice from the Cross. In these two senses the Law, even the law of the Sabbath, is to us as completely a thing of the past as is the schooling of our childhood.

But underneath the legal and symbolic aspects of the Sabbath, which pertain only to the Old Covenant, lay an element of universal and abiding value, viz. the manifold benefit of the weekly rest. To secure this benefit for Israel, and through Israel for the world, God embodied the Sabbath in the Law and Ritual of the Old Covenant. And when the Old Covenant was superseded by the New, Christ secured for His Church the same advantages by paying special honour to the first day of the week. But, like everything in the Gospel, the Lord's Day is not so much a law as a free gift of God. While keeping it we think, not of the penalty of disobedience, but of the great benefits received thereby in the kind providence of God: and we spend the day, not according to a written prescription, but in such way as seems to us most conducive to our spiritual growth. Thus the Lord's Day is a Christian counterpart of the Jewish Sabbath; and differs from it only as the Gospel differs from the Law.

Similarly, as a visible embodiment of the truth that our salvation comes through the shed blood of the innocent, the Jewish sacrifices have in some sense a Christian counterpart in the Lord's Supper. And the rite of Infant Baptism, which is not expressly enjoined in the New Testament, reproduces in the Christian Church, by recognising the relation of little ones to the God of their fathers, a part of the spiritual significance of circumcision.

We understand now Paul's indifference in Rom. xiv. 5 whether we esteem one day above another, or all days equally. Seen in the full light of the Gospel, all days are equal: for all are spent for Christ. And the service we render Him in the common duties of daily life is as precious in His sight and as rich an outflow of Christian life as are the meditation and evangelical activity of the Lord's Day. This is perfectly consistent with the consecration of one day a week for the latter, and the equal consecration of six days for the former, kind of service.

Nor is the absence from the New Testament of any express teaching about the relation of the Lord's Day to the Jewish

Sabbath and the Fourth Commandment difficult to understand. Any such teaching in the Epistle before us would have seriously blunted, by inevitable misinterpretation, Paul's resistance to the advocates of the Mosaic Law as still binding on Christians. Abundant proofs of this relation were stored in the sacred Volume. The inference from these proofs was left to be observed, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in the later ages of the Church. And in the meantime, by Christ and by the apostolic Church an unique honour was paid to the first day of the week which marked it out unmistakably as the Day of Days.

In exact accord with the above exposition is the usage of early Christian writers. The first day of the week is constantly called the Lord's Day, and spoken of as specially honoured and as the chosen day of Christian worship. But, so far as I know, not until the Council of Macon in A.D. 585 have we any hint of a transfer of the sacred rest from the seventh to the first day, or of obligation to keep the Lord's Day on the ground of the Fourth Commandment. Very interesting is Augustine's note on Ps. xci. 1, where he contrasts the Jews' Sabbath, which he says they waste in bodily idleness, with the Christians' inward rest, which he calls the Sabbath of the heart. The whole note makes us almost certain that Augustine did not look upon the Lord's Day as a Christian counterpart of the Jewish Sabbath. Equally interesting is a treatise of doubtful authorship and date on *The Sabbath and Circumcision* attributed to Athanasius, in which, although the Lord's Day is not called a Sabbath or placed in any relation to the Fourth Commandment, it is nevertheless shown to stand in close relation to the Jewish Sabbath. See also the much earlier quotation on p. 118 from the Epistle of Barnabas.

The first Christian Emperor, Constantine, decreed, in A.D. 321, that all judges and people residing in cities rest from work on Sunday, permitting only agriculture. He thus recognised publicly the Day of Rest as a Christian institution.

But neither imperial decrees nor command of the ancient Law of God nor tradition of the Early Church are needed by those who have experienced the great and various benefit of the rest and leisure of the Lord's Day. The greatness of the benefit is to them abundant proof of the divine origin and authority of the Christian Day of Rest.

SECTION XVII.

PERSONAL APPEAL TO THE GALATIANS

CH. IV. 12—20.

Become as I am, *because also I* have become *as* ye are, *brethren, I beg you. No injustice have ye done me.* [13] *And ye know that because of weakness of the flesh I preached the Gospel to you the first time:* [14] *and your temptation in my flesh ye did not despise nor loathe, but as an angel of God ye welcomed me, as Christ Jesus.* [15] *Where then* is *your professed happiness? For I bear you witness that, if possible, your own eyes ye would have dug out and given to me.* [16] *So then am I become your enemy by speaking truth to you?*

[17] *Zealously they care for you, not in a good way: but they wish to shut you out, that ye may care for them zealously.* [18] *And* a *good* thing it is *to be zealously cared for in a good* matter *always, and not only when I am present with you,* [19] *my little children, for whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you.* [20] *I could wish to be present with you now, and to change my voice: because I am perplexed about you.*

After the application to the readers, in § 16, of the foregoing argument, now follows (*vv.* 12—16) a personal and loving appeal based on their welcome to Paul on his first visit to Galatia; then comes (*vv.* 17—20) the first direct reference, after ch. i. 7, to the men who were leading them astray.

12. A direct appeal prompted by Paul's fear lest his labours for his readers be without result. *Become as I* am: i.e. free from the legal bondage implied in their observance (*v.* 10) of sacred days: not 'do as I do;' for (see under *v.* 11) Paul himself kept the Jewish ritual. His motive in so doing differed infinitely from that of his opponents: cp. 1 Cor. ix. 20 with Acts xv. 1, 5. *Because also I, etc.:* a fact added to the foregoing entreaty, as a reason for it. By recognising the emptiness of Jewish prerogatives and thus laying them aside, Paul, a born Jew, placed himself on the spiritual level of his readers, who were born Gentiles. He now entreats them to come down, by laying aside the fancied superiority of Jewish proselytes, to the common level which he has long ago accepted. Thus Paul brings to bear, on those who as strangers were seeking preroga-

tives which were his by birth and to which from childhood he had been taught to cling proudly, the example of his own surrender of these prerogatives as worthless. Similar appeals to his own example, in 1 Cor. viii. 13, x. 33. Those to whom he appeals, he, a born Jew, recognises as *brethren*.

No injustice; so literally: or *no injury*, without thought of injustice, as in Lk. x. 19: for, as the derivation of the words suggests, injury is usually injustice. A close parallel, in 2 Cor. xii. 13. The utter obscurity now of these words points to facts known to the readers but not to us. The emphasis rests, not on *me* in contrast to others, but on the negative: *in NOTHING have ye done me injustice.* Nor does this emphatic and unexpected denial refer necessarily to Paul's visit to Galatia. [The Greek aorist covers the entire past to the moment of writing.] This denial was suggested naturally by Paul's loving appeal; and suitably prefaces his mention of the welcome given to him by the Galatians on his first visit.

13, 14. Not only had his readers done Paul no injustice or injury, but on his first visit, although it was occasioned merely by sickness, they welcomed him with eager affection. This he recalls in order to arouse now a similar affection, and thus strengthen his own appeal. *Weakness:* absence of strength, of any kind. It is the usual term for sickness, of which absence of bodily strength is a constant mark: so Ph. ii. 26f, 2 Tim. iv. 20, Mt. x. 8, Mk. vi. 56, Lk. iv. 40, Jno. xi. 1—6, Acts iv. 9, v. 15f. And this is the only meaning which will make sense here. *Of the flesh:* the material of our bodies, which by its nature is in various ways (cp. Rom. viii. 3, Mt. xxvi. 41) weak or liable to weakness. *Because of weakness, etc.:* i.e. detained in Galatia by some sickness. This led him to preach the Gospel and found Churches there. Thus Paul's sickness brought *good-news* (see under i. 6) to his readers. *The first time:* or literally *the former-time.* It contrasts a former with a later visit. And, since contrast with the present was needless, (for this is sufficiently indicated by *preached-the-Gospel,*) it implies that twice Paul had preached in Galatia. If so, these words give definiteness to the statement in *v.* 13: otherwise they are meaningless.

The first recorded visit of Paul to Galatia is that mentioned in Acts xvi. 6, on his second missionary journey. And we have no difficulty in supposing that then he was detained in Galatia by illness and founded Churches there. Another visit, on his third journey, is recorded in Acts xviii. 23. And we cannot well con-

ceive any other earlier visit. Consequently, not earlier than this last visit was the letter before us written. See Diss. iii.

That the Gospel was first preached to the Galatians by a man who lingered among them merely because of bodily weakness, put to a severe test their readiness to receive the truth. Many hearers would have turned away from a Gospel proclaimed by a sick man. Consequently, the sickness *in* Paul's *flesh* was a *trial* or *temptation* (see under 1 Cor. x. 13) to his readers. And, since the afflicted man was an embodiment of this trial, had they turned from him with disgust, they would have *despised* and *loathed the temptation* which God had laid upon them. Instead of this, they *welcomed* him (literally received with outstretched right hand) *as* though he were a visitant from heaven, *an angel of* mercy from *God*. Nay more. They welcomed him with the reverence they would have paid to his divine Master, to *Christ Jesus*. The words *despise* and *loathe* suggest that Paul's sickness was of a kind calculated to evoke contempt and disgust.

15. Question prompted by the foregoing statement. *Where, then:* as in Rom. iii. 27; cp. 1 Cor. i. 20, xii. 17, 19, xv. 55. It implies that their gratulation had vanished from view. *Your professed happiness:* literally *your pronouncing-happy*, or *blessed*. Same word in Rom. iv. 6, 9; see note: cognate word in Rom. iv. 7f, Mt. v. 3—11 They pronounced themselves *happy*, i.e. fortunate in the highest and holiest sense, because Paul had visited them. Of this felt good fortune, the enthusiasm of their welcome (*v.* 14) was proof and measure. Paul therefore supports his question by the following emphatic statement.

Paul is able to *bear-witness* in his reader's favour. *Your*, is not emphatic, as though in contrast with Paul's *eyes*. Consequently, these words in no way suggest that Paul's complaint was in his eyes. *Dug out your eyes:* same words (LXX.) in 1 Sam. xi. 2; cp. Jud. xvi. 21: graphic description of a painful and ruinous operation. Even this costly, and in fact impossible, gift would not have been too great in their view to express the benefits they had received from the preaching of Paul. This testimony, the readers knew to be true. Paul asks therefore what has become of this recognition of spiritual benefits.

16. An inference from *v.* 15, thrown because of its unlikeliness into the form of a question. *Your enemy:* or *an enemy of yours:* one intent on doing you harm. Paul's earnestness suggests this rather than the weaker sense, 'one hated by you.' The Galatians

treated Paul as though he were actually hostile to them. And, since he was formerly so valued a friend, if he be now an *enemy*, as his readers suppose or act as though they supposed, he has *become* such: i.e. a change has taken place. Paul asks the reason. He has done nothing but *speak-truth*. Is this then the cause of the change? The precise reference of Paul's question is unknown to us. It cannot be the letter he is now writing: for he refers to his readers' present judgment about him. The easiest explanation is that on his second visit Paul rebuked a tendency to Judaism then visible: and that this rebuke was used by his enemies to alienate from him the Galatian Christians. He asks whether words which they know to be true have made a valued friend into an enemy.

Review of *vv.* 12—16. Moved by fear which their observance of Jewish festivals inspires, Paul reminds his readers that he a born Jew has laid aside all Jewish prerogatives; and makes a brotherly appeal to them to lay aside the Jewish entanglements which were bringing them into bondage. He recalls the eagerness with which at the first they welcomed him, when as a sick man he lingered among them. Their devotion to the preacher knew no limits: and it proclaimed the benefits they had received from his preaching. Since then, all that Paul has done has been to speak what they know to be true. He asks if this has made their former friend into a foe.

The above is, like ch. iii. 1, 2, an appeal to the readers' early Christian life in proof of the truth of the word they then received.

It is also a welcome addition to the narrative of Paul's life. We see him detained by serious illness (for no other would hinder him) among people of strange nationality and speech. We can imagine him preaching to them in great bodily weakness. But his word produced immediate and wonderful results. The preacher was welcomed with enthusiasm. And various scattered but flourishing Churches were formed among the Keltic settlers of Galatia. We have also an indication of a second visit: and Paul's silence suggests that even then his converts' loyalty to their great teacher had begun to decline.

These biographical notes agree with Acts xvi. 6 where we find Paul passing through Galatia; and with xviii. 23 where we find him visiting disciples in 'the Galatian country.'

Whether Paul's sickness in Galatia had any relation to his probably much earlier stake in the flesh, is quite uncertain. See under 2 Cor. xii. 7. But this abiding affliction reveals some kind

of bodily unsoundness: nnd this might easily give rise to a passing illness which would detain the apostle.

17. A silent reference to Paul's opponents in Galatia. That he does not find it needful to mention them expressly, proves that they are already present to his thought. Cp. v. 10, vi. 12f. And direct mention of them would be unpleasant. *Zealously-care-for you:* or *they-are-zealous* or *jealous-about you:* same word and construction in 1 Cor. xii. 31, 'Be zealous for the greater gifts;' and 2 Cor. xi. 2, 'I am jealous about you.' 'They are very eager about you;' i.e. for your benefit apparently, and for your favour. *Not in-a-good-way*, or *manner:* expounded by *they wish, etc.*, which states the motive of their earnest effort. From whom or what, the false teachers *wish to-shut-out* the Galatian Christians, Paul does not say. He fixes attention simply on the designed isolation. The practical effect of the false teaching will be exclusion from Christ, from the Gospel and its blessings, and from the community of faithful Christians. But a special reference to these last is not required by the emphatic word *them*, as though the false teachers were compared with those from whom they would shut out the Galatian Christians: for it is simply a contrast to *you*, the excluders and the excluded being thus brought face to face. And Paul's exact reference remains uncertain, and not very important. If the Galatian Christians yield to the disturbers and become circumcised, they will be *shut out* of that element in which they have found life and peace; and will become dependent on the favour and help of those who have led them astray. Consequently, the seduced will be compelled to court their seducers. And this Paul declares to be (*that ye may, etc.*) the purpose of the seduction.

Since the last word of *v.* 17 is the first word of 1 Cor. xii. 31, the four Greek-Latin uncials insert after it 'But be zealous for the better gifts:' an interesting example of the way in which error has crept into our MSS.

18. A general statement suggested by the zealous efforts of these false friends to gain the Galatian Christians. It glides imperceptibly into a description of Paul's own zeal for them, which is an example of the general statement. *A good thing it is to be an object of earnest attention*, provided it be *in a good matter*, i.e. with a good aim, this aim looked upon as the element of the earnest effort. Paul's aim is (2 Cor. xi. 2) to present a pure maiden to Christ. The word *always* has no perceptible reference to the false teachers, (for we have no hint that their

zeal was not constant,) but completes the transition, through this general remark, from Paul's opponents to himself; and records a marked feature of his own zeal, viz. its constancy. This thought is further developed, without any reference to the false teachers, in the words following. Paul's care for his readers is not limited to his presence with them. Indeed it prompts him now to write this earnest letter, and makes him wishful (*v.* 20) to be with them again.

[Ζηλοῦσθαι is passive, corresponding to the active forms in *v.* 17, and in the same sense: for a change of sense would need to be clearly marked, as in Rom. xiv. 13, to avoid mistake; especially here where the same sense gives an intelligent meaning. Moreover the middle voice of this verb is unknown elsewhere; and would have here practically the same sense as the active voice, and be therefore inexplicable. The emphasis is not on με, as though contrasting Paul with the false teachers, but on παρεῖναι, contrasting Paul's presence with his absence. This is confirmed by the appearance of the same word in *v.* 20.]

19. An expression of Paul's love for his readers, and a proof of the intensity of his effort on their behalf. As being a sort of climax, it is most easily joined to the foregoing sentence. [And the preposition δέ in *v.* 20 suggests, but does not prove, that it begins a new sentence.] The Vat., Sinai, and Greek-Latin MSS., a combination seldom in error, read *my children*, as in 1 Cor. iv. 14, using a word very common with Paul. But the Alex., Ephraim, and later MSS., a combination often in evident error, read *my little-children*, as in 1 Jno. ii. 1: cp. *little-children* in Jno. xiii. 33, 1 Jno. ii. 12, 28, iii. 7, 18, iv. 4, v. 21. The difference is only one small letter. So appropriate here is the tender expression *little-children*, nowhere else found in Paul, and so easily changed to the common word *children*, that Westcott prefers it, placing in his margin *my children*, which last is read by Tischendorf and without note by Tregelles. Thus external and internal evidence are at variance, which rarely happens. Perhaps probability inclines to *my little-children*. But certain decision is impossible. Paul's earnest and constant efforts for his readers remind him that they are helpless as *little children* needing a parent's care, and that they are his own little children. He therefore accosts them with a father's affection and solicitude. Cp. 1 Cor. iv. 14, Philem. 10.

The undeveloped spiritual life of the Galatian Christians, Paul compares to the undeveloped state of an unborn embryo; and

compares his own painful anxiety for them to a mother's birth-pangs, which can cease only when the development of the embryo is complete. For, till his readers show a Christian character in some degree mature, Paul's anxiety will continue. *Again:* as though a mother were twice enduring birth-pangs for the same offspring. The desired development, Paul describes as *Christ formed in you:* i.e. the Spirit of Christ dwelling in them (ii. 20) changing their outer life into moral likeness to Christ. Thus in them men will see the *form* of *Christ*, a visible manifestation of His actual inward presence. See under Rom. ii. 20: cp. xii. 2, 2 Cor. iii. 18, Phil. ii. 6f, 2 Tim. iii. 5. This comparison reveals how intense is Paul's effort (*v.* 18) for his readers, and how pure his motive.

20. A *wish* prompted by the readers' undeveloped state and by Paul's anxiety about them. *Would that I were present with you now!* a wish, felt to be vain, suggested by the words *present with you* in *v.* 18, which recall Paul's earnest efforts for their good when he was in Galatia. He *could wish* to be with them *now*, (this last word emphatic,) instead of merely writing to them from a distance. *And to change my voice:* purpose of this impracticable wish. Paul's love suggests that if he were himself with his readers he could bring them to a better mind, which would enable him to speak to them in a *voice* different from his present severity. *Perplexed:* not knowing which way to go. Same word in 2 Cor. iv. 8, Lk. xxiv. 4, Acts xxv. 20, Jno. xiii. 22. That Paul does not know what to do to restore his relapsing converts, is the *cause* of his consciously futile wish to be with them now. Thus, like § 16, so § 17 closes with dark foreboding.

Only for a moment does Paul refer to the false teachers, as though reluctant to give them a place on his pages. But his few words lay bare the selfish motive of their earnestness. Still greater earnestness for the Galatian Christians, with a motive as pure as theirs is selfish, does Paul whether present or absent ever cherish. For they are his own children. And till they bear the image of Christ there is nothing but anguish for him. His present perplexity makes him long to be with them now, hoping that his presence would effect the change he so earnestly desires.

SECTION XVIII.

THE COVENANTS OF BONDAGE AND OF FREEDOM.

CH. IV. 21—V. 1.

Tell me, ye who wish to be under law, do ye not hear the Law? 22 *For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the maid and one by the free woman.* 23 *Yet he by the maid was born according to flesh: but he by the free woman, through promise.* 24 *Which things contain an allegory. For these women are two covenants; one from Mount Sinai bearing children for bondage, which is Hagar.* 25 *Now this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia; and stands in line with the Jerusalem that now is: for she is in bondage with her children.* 26 *But the Jerusalem above is free, which is our mother.* 27 *For it is written, "Rejoice, barren one that bearest not; burst forth and shout, thou that dost not travail in birth. For many are the children of the desolate woman, more than of her who has the husband."* (Isa. liv. 1). *And we, brethren, like Isaac are children of promise.*

29 *But just as then he that was born according to flesh was persecuting him* born *according to Spirit, so also now.* 30 *But what says the Scripture? "Cast out the maid and her son: for the son of the maid shall not inherit with the son of the free woman."* (Gen. xxi. 10.) 31 *For which cause, brethren, we are not children of a maid but of the free woman.* 1 *For freedom, Christ has made us free. Stand then, and be not again held fast by a yoke of bondage.*

Another appeal, an argument based upon facts recorded in the Book of the Law taken in connection with the teaching in iii. 23, iv. 1—3 that all who are under law are in bondage.

21. *Law:* the general principle, 'Do this and live.' *Under law:* as in *v.* 4, Rom. vi. 14. *Wish to be under law;* describes suitably an apostacy now going on, as do the present tenses in i. 6, iv. 9, v. 3, 4, vi. 12, 13. They desire to have as the basis of their relation to God, and as the means of obtaining His favour, a prescribed rule of conduct, viz. the rule embodied in the five Books of Moses: i.e. practically, they *wish* to stand, or rather to lie in helpless bondage, *under* the authority of *law. Hear the Law:* cp. Rom. ii. 13, Jno. xii. 34. It recalls vividly

the public reading in the synagogues, when this was, for Jews and proselytes, the chief means of acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures. Paul asks of those who wish to be under a prescribed rule, Do you not hear what is said by those Books which are an authoritative embodiment of such rule?

22, 23. The foregoing question will now be justified by a fact about Abraham recorded in the Books of the Law. *Two sons;* prepares us for a difference between them. *Maid:* same word in Gen. xvi. 1, 3, 5f, 8, xxi. 10, 12f; Mt. xxvi. 69, Acts xii. 13, xvi. 16: in N. T. always a maid-servant, but not so Ruth iv. 12. The word *free* implies that here *the maid* was a slave. *Abraham had one* son *by the* well-known *maid*-servant, *and one by the* well-known *free woman. According to flesh:* the process of birth corresponding to the constitution of human or animal bodies. This reminds us that Ishmael stood to Abraham in the same relation as the Jews of Paul's day, viz. that of natural descent. This is embodied in the argument of Rom. ix. 8. [The Greek perfect tense intimates that the birth of Ishmael *according to flesh* has abiding significance. So 1 Cor. xv. 4, 14, 27. In reference to events so definite, the English language, which has no tense corresponding to the Greek perfect, uses the preterite, *was born.*] *Through*, or *by means of, promise.* Not only was Isaac's birth a fulfilment of promise, but the faith elicited by the promise was an essential condition, according to the principles of the kingdom of God, of the putting forth of divine power and of the fulfilment of the promise. Hence *the promise* was the channel *through* which the power of God operated, producing first faith, in Abraham, and then the birth of Isaac. Similarly, in the birth of Jesus a promise to Mary was the vehicle through which the Spirit of God operated. 'Although both were sons of Abraham, *yet* the offspring of *the slave girl* was born (and the significance of this fact remains) according to the ordinary laws of human bodies, the offspring of *the free woman* was produced by the special voice of God, by the word of *promise* which Abraham believed.'

24. *Which things:* or rather, *which class of things. Contain an allegory*, or *are-allegorized:* they have another meaning beside the historical one. Same word and tense in Philo, vol. i. p. 143: "The cherubim are, according to one manner, in this way allegorized." So Clement of Alex., *Exhortation* ch. xi.: "The serpent is allegorized as pleasure, crawling upon its belly,

an earthly vice, turning to matter." That the narratives of Genesis are fact, Paul ever assumes: see my *Romans*, Diss. iii. He now declares that under the facts (as Philo says of the cherubim) lies spiritual significance. This significance, the rest of *v.* 24 explains. *Are two covenants:* cp. 1 Cor. xi. 25, 'This cup is the New Covenant.' In a mutual relation similar to the relation of *these* two *women* there actually *are two covenants*. Therefore, in Paul's thought, and in objective reality, (for the relationships are real,) the women and the covenants are the same. So the word 'is,' denoting practical identity, in Rom. i. 12, 16, 1 Jno. v. 3, 4, Mt. xiii. 37—39. *The two covenants;* recalls 2 Cor. iii. 6, written probably shortly before this letter.

Of these *two covenants*, *one* is expounded in *vv.* 24*b*, 25; the other, under an altered form of speech, in *vv.* 26—28. The Old Covenant, an abiding possession, was received *from* God speaking on *Mount Sinai*. *Bearing children for bondage:* just as children of a slave-mother are also slaves. This metaphor is the more easy because the word rendered *covenant* is feminine. They who accept the Law as the basis of their relation to God, and whose religious life is derived from and determined by it, are children of the Covenant (cp. 'sons of the Covenant,' Acts iii. 25) which had its origin at Sinai. And Paul has shown (iii. 10—iv. 3) that, in consequence of the nature of the covenant then given, such persons are, and must be, in bondage. Thus their position is analogous to that of the boy who, though Abraham's offspring, yet, because his mother was a servant, was not a sharer of the rights of Abraham's son. For, the religious life derived from the Law, a life of bondage, was derived from God who gave the Law at Sinai. That Ishmael was not actually a slave, does not weaken this comparison. For, because he was a slave's child, he could not claim a son's rights. And this defect of Ishmael, the Jews eagerly asserted.

25. Between readings (1) *Now this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia* and (2) *For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia*, evidence is almost equally balanced. We find *r.* 1 in the Vat. and Alex. MSS., the Latin part of the Clermont MS., and the Coptic version; evidence perhaps slightly stronger than that for *r.* 2, viz. the Sinai and Ephraim MSS., two Greek-Latin uncials, and the Latin Vulgate Version. Uniting these two readings, the later Greek MSS. and the Syriac Version which often accompanies them read (3) *for this Hagar is Mount Sinai, etc.* Chrysostom read, as the tenor of his exposition proves, *this Hagar is Mount*

Sinai. And existing copies of his exposition read also *for this Hagar, etc.* But the difference between *now* and *for* does not affect his argument. Consequently, in view of the great frequency of this last reading in later copies, we cannot be sure that Chrysostom himself accepted it. It seems to me that the documentary evidence for *r.* 1 preponderates slightly over that for *r.* 2. The difference is only three Greek letters, which must have been wrongly either inserted or omitted. Their accidental insertion is perhaps rather the more easy to conceive. For the insertion of A, making ΓΑΡ into ΑΓΑΡ, might have been suggested by the same word at the end of *v.* 24: and the need for a particle would suggest the insertion of ΔΕ. But this possibility only counterbalances the slightly preponderant documentary evidence.

Of Critical Editors, Lachmann gives *r.* 2 in his text, *r.* 1 in his margin. Tischendorf gave *r.* 3 in his 7th, and gives *r.* 2 in his 8th, edition. Tregelles places *r.* 3 in his text and *r.* 1 in his margin. Even the joint editors part company here, Westcott preferring *r.* 2 and Hort *r.* 1: but, like the RV., their joint text gives *r.* 1, with *r.* 2 in the margin.

Amid this conflict of evidence and opinion, I shall further test the readings by endeavouring to expound them.

Reading 1. *This Hagar*; i.e. Hagar looked upon, not as a woman, but simply as an abstract object of thought and comparison. Already Paul has said that one covenant 'is Hagar.' With Hagar he now links in his allegory *Mount Sinai*, from which (*v.* 24) the covenant was received: *Is*: as in *v.* 24: in the allegory, Hagar and Sinai are the same. To assert this practical identity, is the purpose of *v.* 25*a*. *In Arabia*: recalls the geographical position of *Sinai*, where in solitary grandeur, away from the land promised to Abraham, the rugged mountain looks down upon the wilderness home of the children of Hagar. The position of Sinai reveals the appropriateness of the allegory. And this sufficiently accounts for these words, without the exposition of Chrysostom: "The bondwoman was called Hagar; and Mount Sinai is thus interpreted in the language of the locality." For this last statement we have hardly any confirmatory evidence. Some Arabian tribes bore their mother's name: e.g. Ps. lxxxiii. 6, 1 Chr. v. 10, 20; Eratosthenes in Strabo, bk. xvi. 767. Possibly this tribal name may have been heard by Paul during his sojourn in Arabia, and have suggested the contrast of the sons of Hagar and of Sarah. But even this

supposition is needless. We notice, however, that the Epistle which tells of Paul's journey to Arabia contains this comparison. It may have been suggested by meditations on the spot.

Goes in the same line: like soldiers in file. It recalls (Aristotle, *Nicom. Ethics* bk. i. 6. 7) the Pythagorean Lists of corresponding Opposites. In such a list, Hagar, Ishmael, Sinai, the Old Covenant, the now Jerusalem would stand opposite to Sarah, Isaac, Golgotha, the New Covenant, the Jerusalem above. Paul has just said that in his allegory Hagar, the mother of the alien race, is identical with Mount Sinai whence they who trust in the Law derive their spiritual life. He now takes the allegory a step further by saying that Hagar is in the same line with *Jerusalem that now is*, or *the now Jerusalem*, the metropolis of the Jewish state and seat of the old Theocracy. This statement, the following words prove. *Is-in-bondage:* viz. *Jerusalem*, as proved by the contrast with 'Jerusalem above' which 'is free.' Moreover, to say that Hagar is in bondage, etc., would merely and needlessly repeat *v.* 24*b*, and would do nothing to prove that either she or Mount Sinai goes *in the same line with the now Jerusalem:* whereas, that Jerusalem is in bondage, etc., as practically proved in iii. 23—iv. 9, places the Mother-City of the Jews in line with Hagar and her banished offspring; which is the chief point of this allegory. *With her children:* cp. Mt. xxiii. 37.: with those who look up to the old Theocratic state as their political and spiritual mother. For these are under the Law, and therefore (cp. iii. 23ff) in spiritual bondage; by the very nature of the Theocracy to which they owe their spiritual life.

Reading 2 should probably be rendered *For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia.* It calls attention to the geographical position of Sinai, giving definiteness to our conception of the great mountain and silently reminding us that it was the home of Hagar's children. Paul then, without further mention of Hagar, says that Sinai belongs to the same category as the present Jerusalem. For this statement, the following proof still holds good: for, that Jerusalem *is in bondage with her children*, places her in the same line both with the mother of the exiled race and with the *mountain in Arabia* whence Israel derived its spiritual life.

Since it was more important, for Paul's argument, to place Jerusalem in relation with Hagar, whom all Jews regarded as an alien, as in *r.* 1, rather than with Sinai, on which all looked with reverence, and since for *r.* 1 the documentary evidence slightly

preponderates, we may perhaps accept it, with the RV., as slightly the more likely.

If we had proof that Sinai was actually called Hagar, we might take *v.* 25*a* to mean that in Arabia Hagar is a name given to Sinai. But, as we have seen, this is needless for the argument. For, that Mount Sinai is in the land of Hagar's children, whether or not the mountain bore her name, reveals in clear light the appropriateness of Paul's allegory.

26. The second of the 'two Covenants,' described in an altered form suggested by the foregoing words. *Jerusalem above:* or *the above Jerusalem*. Cp. 'the heavenly Jerusalem,' Heb. xii. 22; 'the new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven,' Rev. xxi. 2; 'the city having the foundations,' Heb. xi. 10; 'the city to come,' xiii. 14. It is the future home of the saved, looked upon as a city and a metropolis. The above different conceptions of it, we may harmonize by conceiving it as already existing in the purpose and forethought of God and influencing the thought and action of men. This city *is free*, with all that pertains to it. Restraint is needless there, and unknown. *Our mother:* that city is a mother, and we are her children. For it is the source, by the laws of spiritual generation, of our spiritual life; a life which partakes the nature of its source: in other words, our spiritual life is an outflow of the eternal and divine forces which will find their visible and necessary manifestation in that future city. Moreover, the city will be an integral part of the place of glory where already, surrounded by angels, the Risen Saviour sits enthroned. Therefore, to that future city we already look up as our mother. That city is no mere idea we are endeavouring to realise, and whose realisation is contingent; but actual reality, infinitely more real than the things we see around us. This eternal and spotless City stands in absolute contrast to that towards which the men of the Old Covenant looked up with filial reverence or fanatical devotion.

27. Proof that the Jerusalem above is a mother, and we her children. It is word for word (LXX.) from Isa. liv. 1; and recalls xlix. 17—23, li. 17—20, lii. 1, 2, liv. 4—13, lx. 4, lxii. 4, 5, lxvi. 7, 8. It is also an outburst of song evoked by this momentary vision of the heavenly city, and suitably clothed in the language of ancient prophecy. *Barren:* a past state spoken of as if now present, for vivid contrast with the actual present. *She that does not bear:* an abiding and melancholy characteristic. *Burst forth:* with joy, as implied by the word *rejoice*. The

Hebrew reads 'shout for joy . . . break forth a joyful shout.' *Does not travail with child:* more graphic than *does not bear.* (Cp. Isa. lxvi. 7.) *Desolate:* not only barren but without a husband, in lonely solitude. Yet she has *many children*, more even than some other woman who with her husband are (in the LXX.) definite objects of the prophet's thought.

After his vision of the smitten Servant of Jehovah, who 'bore the sin of many,' Isaiah bursts into song, in view of the glory which will follow. In this song he bids Jerusalem join, describing her as a woman once without children and even without husband, but now having many sons. For, God (*v.* 5) is her husband: and her sons will be taught by Him and have great peace. The prophet's words imply sudden and unexpected and great increase of the citizens of the Kingdom of God; and infinite splendour and blessing awaiting them. These words found no adequate fulfilment in the exiles returning from captivity. But Paul had seen thousands of aliens and heathens turning to God, entering by the power of God a new life derived from above, and becoming children of God. And he looked forward to the day when these lately born children of the one Father will tread the streets of that city which from afar Isaiah saw. Already, in the unchangeable purpose of God, and to the eye of faith, the city stands secure in heaven, the eternal home of freedom. Its future inhabitants look up to it with longing eyes; and from it derive all their hopes. In this wondrous accession to the people of God Paul sees fulfilled the ancient prophecy: and the vision moves him to re-echo the prophet's song. The prophecy also justifies his assertion that Jerusalem above is mother of his readers and himself.

Whatever may have been Isaiah's own thought, Paul's exposition points to the reality which in indistinct and distant outline the prophet saw. His exposition is, therefore, in the highest sense correct. It is reproduced by Justin, 1st *Apology*, ch. 53.

28. As *v.* 27 justified the word 'mother' in *v.* 26, so *v.* 28 justifies the word 'our' by proving that Paul and his readers are among 'the children' foretold by Isaiah. The reading *we* or *ye* is uncertain and unimportant. *Like Isaac:* on the model of Isaac, our birth corresponding with his. *Children of promise:* almost the same words in Rom. ix. 8, proving how familiar to Paul was this thought. It recalls *v.* 23*b*. *Of promise:* viz. the Gospel, the instrument by which God brought

into being His children in Galatia. Cp. 1 Cor. iv. 15, Jas. i. 18. Now, only in those whom by the Gospel promise God adds to His family does the above-quoted prophecy of Isaiah find fulfilment. Consequently, not only is (*v.* 26) 'the Jerusalem above' a 'mother' but she is 'our mother.'

29. A further development of the analogy, a contrast and a comparison. *But*, or *nevertheless:* although children of promise, yet, *just-as* Isaac was *then*, so we *also now* are exposed to persecution. *Born according to flesh:* the point of contrast (*v.* 23) with Isaac. *According to Spirit;* Rom. viii. 4, 5: the Holy Spirit as a standard determining the manner of birth. For He (Jno. iii. 5) is the agent of the new birth: and all His works correspond with His nature. (Notice that whatever comes through belief of a promise is wrought by the *Spirit*, the divine Agent of all supernatural good.) The word here is suggested by Paul's constant contrast of *flesh* and *Spirit:* iii. 3, v. 16, 17, vi. 8, Rom. viii. 4. The Hebrew text of Gen. xxi. 9 reads, 'Sarah saw the son of Hagar . . . mocking:' but the LXX. reads, 'playing with Isaac her son.' Sarah's demand, made at the festival, implies some aggravation from Ishmael: and her comparison of the two boys suggests that the aggravation was something done to Isaac. And this idea was taken up by Jewish tradition. This ridicule from Ishmael Paul describes, in order to place the Christians of his day in line with Isaac, by the word *persecuted*, which recalls the many persecutions aroused against Christians by Jews: cp. 1 Th. ii. 14, Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 5, 19.

30. *But:* or *nevertheless*, as in *v.* 29: a complete and now triumphant contrast. The words of Sarah, (Gen. xxi. 10 nearly word for word from the LXX.,) inasmuch as her request was approved by God, are introduced simply as *the Scripture says:* so Rom. ix. 17, x. 11; cp. Gal. iii. 8, 22. This implies that for Paul *the Scripture* had the authority of God. He quotes that authority in the literary form in which it lay before him. That Sarah's petulant request obtained God's sanction, and that a trifling sport of Ishmael caused his expulsion from Abraham's home lest his presence should interfere with the unique honour due to Isaac, reveal in clearest light the infinite difference of position between the 'two sons.' This difference gives great force to the contrast in *vv.* 23—28. The last words of *v.* 30 are changed from 'with my son, even with Isaac' to *with the son of the free woman*, to suit Paul's quotation. The change also

places the two mothers in conspicuous contrast, *the maid* or *slave girl* and *the free woman*. *Inherit:* Gen. xv. 3, 4, 7, 8, xvii. 8; receive, in virtue of relation to Abraham, the blessings promised to Abraham's children.

31. Result, not inference, from *v.* 30. [For διό always points back to a cause or motive, of which it introduces an actual or desired result.] Verse 30 embodies an essential principle of the Kingdom of God which found historic expression in the story of the two sons of Abraham, viz. that the blessings of the Kingdom are for the free and for these only, and that freedom or bondage depends upon the source of our spiritual life. *For* this *cause*, i.e. that we may obtain the inheritance possessed only by the free, God gave us a spiritual life derived from the Gospel, the mother of freemen, not from the Law which by its nature can produce only slaves. The negative side is put generally: *we are not a slave girl's children*, i.e. our relation to Abraham and to God is not derived from a source which involves us in bondage, as the Law would. The positive side is definite, *the free woman:* for there is only one mother of spiritual freemen.

V. 1. General statement linking the allegory to the general teaching of this Epistle. The transition is indicated by the word *Christ*, not found in § 18 till now. *For freedom:* in order that we may enjoy *the* Gospel *freedom*. *Us:* emphatic, revealing our great privilege as compared with others. That we may be free is the aim of (iv. 4) the mission, and (iii. 13) the death, of Christ.

Stand then: practical application of *v.* 1*a*, and of the foregoing allegory. *Stand:* maintain your position of erectness; cp. Rom. xi. 20, 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2 Cor. i. 24. It courteously assumes that the readers, although on the eve of falling, have not yet fallen. So i. 6, iv. 9. *Not again;* recalls iv. 9, 'ye wish to be again in bondage.' *Yoke of bondage:* 1 Tim. vi. 1; cp. Acts xv. 10. It is, like 'maid' in iv. 31, quite general. That *Christ has made us free*, is a motive for not being again held in anything which destroys Christian freedom.

THE ARGUMENT of § 18, we will now endeavour to understand as a whole, and to estimate.

Paul recognised (Rom. iv. 11f) in believers a spiritual offspring of Abraham, in whom, and in them only, will be fulfilled the promises to Abraham and to his seed. Consequently, Abraham has a double offspring, the Jewish nation and the Christian

Church, each looking up to him as father, and claiming inheritance through him. The Jewish nation based its claim on ordinary bodily descent: the Christian Church owes its existence to supernatural power working out in those who believe it, a fulfilment of the Gospel promise. And Paul has proved (e.g. iii. 10) that they whose claim rests on bodily descent are outside the blessings promised to Abraham; which are therefore reserved for those who are sons by supernatural birth. All this recalls, and corresponds with, the historical facts of Abraham's family. For he had two sons, one born according to the ordinary laws of human generation, the other by the extraordinary power of God in one who had believed a promise: and the older was expelled from the home in order that the inheritance might belong only to the younger. Consequently, the Jewish nation and the Christian Church correspond, in these particulars, to Ishmael and Isaac.

Nay more. The Jewish nation owes its spiritual life to the Covenant received from Sinai, a covenant which from its nature can produce only bondmen. For, as Paul has proved, a spiritual life derived from law is helpless bondage. Consequently, Mount Sinai may be called the mother of Judaism, a mother whose children are slaves: and Paul remembers that she raises her rugged head amid the scattered and disinherited sons of Hagar.

Again, for many long centuries the Jewish nation had been looking up to Jerusalem as its mother-city. And this ancient city gives form, not merely to the visions of the old prophets, but to the hopes of the Christian Church. Even to this day we sing of "Jerusalem the golden:" and its foreseen glory and rest have been to Christians in all ages a refuge from fiercest storms. But the city we look for is above. And though actually a place of the future, it is nevertheless the birthplace of our present spiritual life, our home, and our mother. That City and her children, wherever they be, are essentially and for ever free. The wonderful and unexpected increase of her children in Paul's day was the beginning of the fulfilment, of the only worthy fulfilment, of the glorious visions of Isaiah. The Jerusalem above is, therefore, the city he beheld.

This close parallel, like the similar argument in Rom. ix. 7—9, overthrows completely the claims of the Jewish disturbers in Galatia. For their relation to Abraham is simply that of Hagar's descendants. And this reply is made the more crushing by the geographical position of the mountain whence they received the Law in which they trust. The worthlessness of such claims is

revealed by the expulsion from Abraham's home, at the bidding of the mother of the true seed, of Hagar and her son. So far then this historical comparison serves well a legitimate purpose.

But this is not all. Under this apparently accidental coincidence lie important and eternal truths.

Paul has taught (iii. 22—24) that the Law is a necessary preparation for the Gospel. Consequently, the Jewish nation and the Christian Church represent two stages in the development of the kingdom of God, and indeed two stages in the spiritual history of every Christian. And we cannot doubt that the sequence of events was controlled by God to embody in historic form great spiritual realities. Already in Rom. iv. 10ff, we have seen the significance of God's Covenant with Abraham, immediately after his faith and many years before the command to circumcise. Similarly, the long delay in the birth of Isaac is analogous to the delay in the mission of the divine Son into the world. And, without assuming any sanction of God for Abraham's relation to Hagar, we may yet believe that the two sons of Abraham were designed by God to prefigure, even in the order of their birth, the spiritual offspring of the two Covenants of God with man. In other words, abiding truths find expression in historical facts. And this involves the deeper truth that throughout the universe of God great and broad principles find various embodiments, sometimes in trifling details, which details frequently become valuable indications and memorials of the principles they embody.

Probably the above argument was due to Paul's Rabbinical training. And it is an example of the one good element of this training, viz. careful sifting of the spiritual significance of the details of Holy Scripture. Paul's use of Scripture assumes its historic truthfulness; and rests on broad principles already and independently proved to be true. Moreover, both here and elsewhere, he points to a correspondence which bears on its face the mark, not of accident, but of divine purpose.

SECTION XIX.

TO RECEIVE CIRCUMCISION, IS TO REJECT CHRIST.

CH. V. 2—13a.

Behold I Paul say to you that if ye receive circumcision Christ will profit you nothing. 3 *And I protest again to every man receiving circumcision that he is a debtor to do the whole Law.* 4 *Ye have been severed from Christ, whoever of you are being justified in law: from* His *grace ye have fallen away.* 5 *For we, by* the *Spirit, through faith are eagerly waiting for a hope of righteousness.* 6 *For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything nor uncircumcision but faith working through love.*

7 *Ye were running nobly. Who hindered you that ye should not obey* the *truth?* 8 *The persuasion* is *not from Him that calls you.* 9 *A little leaven leavens the whole lump.* 10 *I am confident about you in the Lord that ye will be no otherwise minded. And he that disturbs you will bear the judgment, whoever he be.* 11 *But I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted? Then, of no effect has the snare of the cross become.* 12 *Would that they who unsettle you would even mutilate themselves.* 13 *For ye were called for freedom, Brethren.*

Verses 2—6 bring the argument of DIV. II., which has been in part summed up in the allegory of § 18, to bear on the matter of circumcision. This practical application betrays a chief point in the teaching Paul combats in this Epistle, viz. that all Christians ought to be circumcised. So ch. vi. 12: cp. Acts xv. 1, 5. Then follow in *vv.* 7—12 sundry appeals.

I Paul: the personal influence of the Apostle brought to bear on the matter in hand. So 2 Cor. x. 1.

CIRCUMCISION: now first mentioned. But its casual appearance here without explanation, and again in ch. vi. 12, suggests that it has been in view throughout the Epistle. It was the outward and visible gate into the bondage of the Jewish Law. Circumcision was prescribed by God to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 10) some fourteen or more years after by faith he obtained (xv. 18) the Covenant, as a token (xvii. 11, Rom. iv. 11) and condition of it. As a rite, it was in some sense a forerunner of the Mosaic

ritual: but, as a simple command easily and fully obeyed, it differed altogether from the many-sided Law, to which none could render due obedience. The rite seems (so Josh. v. 5) to have been carefully observed by Israel in Egypt: for we have no hint of a great circumcising at the Exodus. Cp. Ex. iv. 25. Once (Ex. xii. 48) it is assumed, and once (Lev. xii. 3) expressly though casually enjoined in the Law. Yet, strangely, it was not performed in the wilderness; but was restored (Josh. v. 3, 8) at the entrance into Canaan. In the O. T. the word *circumcise* is found again only in Jer. iv. 4, ix. 25, in a spiritual significance. But the common use (Judges xiv. 3, xv. 18, 1 Sam. xiv. 6, xvii. 26, 36, xviii. 25, 27, xxxi. 4, 2 Sam. i. 20, iii. 14) of the word 'uncircumcised' to distinguish the Philistines from Israel proves that in Israel the practice was universal. Practically, circumcision was a part of the Law of Moses, and was the initial rite of the Old Covenant.

If ye-receive-circumcision: not, 'if ye have already been circumcised,' as though past circumcision were a final bar to future salvation; but, 'if ye are now undergoing circumcision,' ye thereby deliberately reject the blessings brought by Christ. [The present subjunctive limits the assertion to the time during which the process of circumcision is going on; this being extended by implication so long as the persons concerned continue in the same mind. Subsequent repentance would remove them from under this tremendous condemnation. But this, Paul leaves now out of sight.] This word implies (so vi. 12) that the Galatian Christians, though already observing sacred days, were as yet only contemplating circumcision. Hence the earnestness of Paul's appeal. *Profit you nothing:* cp. Rom. ii. 25, iii. 1, 1 Cor. xiii. 3, xiv. 6, xv. 32, Heb. iv. 2, xiii. 9, Jas. ii. 14, 16. They will have no part in the infinite gain bought for men by the precious blood of Christ. This statement will be proved in *vv.* 3, 4. And if we receive no gain from Christ, 'through whom are all things,' (1 Cor. viii. 6,) we are poor indeed.

3. *Protest:* literally *call upon* some one, especially God, *as witness* in our favour. It introduces a solemn assertion, as if made in the presence of God. Same word in N. T. only in Eph. iv. 17, 1 Th. ii. 12, Acts xx. 26, xxvi. 22. That all these are from the pen or lips of Paul, is a remarkable coincidence. If on his second visit to Galatia he had made a similar *protest*, to this the word *again* would naturally refer. But this supposi-

tion is by no means necessary. For *v.* 3 is a repetition in stronger language of *v.* 2. *Debtor to do the whole Law*, implies, as *v.* 4 will show, that 'Christ will profit you nothing:' and *every one receiving circumcision* includes 'if ye receive circumcision.' This solemn repetition reveals how terrible is the consequence here deprecated. And we can understand it. For, the only reason for circumcision was its prescription in the Law: cp. Jno. vii. 23. Therefore, to undergo it, was to admit that the Law was still binding; and, if so, it was binding as a condition of the favour of God. Hence to undergo circumcision was (*v.* 4) to seek to be 'justified in law.' But, His favour, none can obtain by law. For none can render to the Law the obedience it requires. Consequently, the continued validity of the Law involves a universal curse Now, from this curse Christ died to save us. Therefore, to maintain, by undergoing circumcision, a Christian's obligation to keep the whole Law, is to reject the benefits of the death of Christ.

4. *Severed:* so removed *from Christ* that in them He will produce no results. Same phrase in same sense in Rom. vii. 2, 6: same word in Rom. iii. 3, 31, Gal. iii. 17, v. 11. It states a fact which justifies the assertion 'Christ will profit you nothing,' in a form suggesting that the cause is in themselves and not in Christ. *Justified in law:* the Mosaic Law, but looked at in the abstract as a rule of conduct, and as a surrounding element *in* which they receive justification. See under iii. 11. *Are-being-justified:* the process now, from their point of view, actually going on. But it can never be completed: iii. 11, Rom. iii. 20. See note under Rom. ii. 4. It is practically the same as 'seeking justification in law;' but is more forcefully represented. Although actual justification in law is impossible, the mere beginning of the fruitless process, as Paul's readers by their observance (iv. 10) of days and seasons had already begun it, had actually separated them from the influences proceeding from the cross of Christ. *From* His *grace:* literally, *from the grace;* of God (ii. 21) and (i. 6) of Christ. This undeserved favour is the source of all spiritual good, and especially of the 'profit' which comes through 'Christ.' Justification *in law* is (Rom. iv. 4) essentially by merit; and thus excludes the free undeserved favour which comes through Christ. *Fallen-away*, or *fallen-out, from:* Jas. i. 11, 2 Pet. iii. 17. It is the exact opposite of 'stand in this grace,' Rom. v. 1; and suggests complete removal and lower position. [The Revisers' rendering, *are*

severed, are fallen, confuses needlessly the Greek perfect and aorist. The aorist merely records a past event, without thought of its results, and may be accurately rendered *have been separated, have fallen*.]

By preparing to be circumcised, the Galatian Christians were entering a process of justification in law, i.e. of justification by obeying the prescriptions of the Law of Moses. They thus acknowledged that in order to enjoy the favour of God they were bound to keep the whole Law: for the whole was given by the same authority. But Christ died in order that upon men who have broken the Law may come the undeserved favour of God. Consequently, to receive circumcision was to place oneself beyond the benefits which proceed from Christ, to abandon the lofty position in the favour of God enjoyed by those who believe the Gospel.

5. *We:* very emphatic, contrasting the spiritual position of Paul and those like him with that of his readers. This contrast proves how far they have 'fallen.' The *Spirit:* of God: for this can be no other than the Spirit received through faith in iii. 2, 14; cp. iv. 6. He is looked at here not as a definite person but in the abstract as an animating principle. By Him was prompted this *eager-waiting:* same word in Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25, 1 Cor. i. 7, Ph. iii. 20, Heb. ix. 28. *Through faith:* subjective source of the *eager waiting*, and (iii. 2, 14) of the Holy Spirit who prompts it. For (Rom. v. 1f) 'by faith . . . we rejoice in hope.' Since *hope* is a stretching forward to good things to come, it is here used objectively as itself to come. So Tit. ii. 13, 'looking for the blessed hope and the appearance, etc.;' Acts xxiv. 15; Col. i. 5, 'the hope laid up for us in heaven.' *Hope of righteousness:* a hope which belongs to, and goes along with, righteousness; cp. Eph. iv. 4, Col. i. 23. Grammatically, *righteousness* might be the object hoped for. But this is unlikely. For, with Paul, the *righteousness* of *faith* is always (cp. Rom. ix. 30, 1 Cor. i. 30) a present blessing; even though *righteousness*, in another sense, viz. the eternal principle of right doing, be still (1 Tim. vi. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 22) a matter of pursuit. And, if *righteousness* were the object *hoped* for, it would be clumsy to represent this hope as itself eagerly waited for. No: Paul waits (2 Tim. iv. 8) for 'the crown of righteousness,' the eternal reward which belongs to the righteous: and for the realisation of this *hope* he eagerly longs. *Righteousness:* as in Rom. iv. 11, 13, ix. 30, x. 4: the position or condition of one whom the judge approves. Of God's

approval, obtained by faith, right doing is a result. This close connection causes occasional ambiguity in the use of the word. *Righteousness* is the link between our *faith* and the *Spirit* who prompts our *Hope*. By faith we obtain the approbation of the Judge: and in token thereof God gives us the Holy Spirit, who moves us to *wait eagerly* for the fulfilment of the visions of future blessing opened to our view by His approbation.

6. A general and contrasted statement, supporting the word '*faith*' in *v.* 5, and concluding the application to circumcision in *vv.* 2—4 of the argument of DIV. II. *In Christ:* the all-surrounding, and yet personal, element of the new life: as in ii. 4, iii. 14, 26, 28, 2 Cor. v. 17. *Avails anything:* literally *has any strength*, i.e. is able to produce results. *Neither circumcision . . . nor uncircumcision:* cp. vi. 15, 1 Cor. vii. 19. Therefore, circumcision neither helps nor hinders life in Christ. This is an express abrogation of the covenant with Abraham, of which (cp. Gen. xvii. 10—14) circumcision was an absolute condition. Similarly, Christ abrogated the Mosaic Law: Mk. vii. 15—19; cp. Lev. xi. 42—45. *But faith:* avails everything, as proved in the argument of iii. 1—14, and implied in *v.* 5. *Working:* producing results, an illustration and proof of the validity of faith. *Love:* to our fellows, as in *v.* 13; its usual sense when not further qualified. So 1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. It is a principle prompting us to draw others to ourselves, that their interests may become ours. This is the direction of the *working* of *faith;* which produces *love* and through love other results. For saving faith is an active principle moulding conduct and character. Cp. 1 Thess. i. 3. It does this (*v.* 22) through the Holy Spirit given (iii. 2, 14) to those who believe. That faith produces results which all must approve, reveals its superiority to circumcision; and thus strengthens the contrast here asserted. This reference to *love* as an effect of faith prepares the way to *vv.* 13—15; as does the word 'Spirit' in *v.* 5 to *vv.* 16—26. Paul thus approaches the moral teaching of DIV. III.

Notice in *vv.* 5, 6 faith, hope, and love; and in the same order as 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

This description of spiritual life proves how great is the profit through Christ lost by those who undergo circumcision in order to obtain justification in the Mosaic Law.

7—13*a*. Sundry direct appeals against the teaching of the disturbers, concluding DIV. II. *Ye-were-running:* in the Christian racecourse, recalling the metaphor of 1 Cor. ix. 24:

cp. Gal. ii. 2. *Nobly:* same word in iv. 17. *Hindered:* as if by breaking up the path. *You:* emphatic. So good was their beginning that Paul asks who (cp. iii. 1) has stopped them by breaking up the path along which they were running so well. *Obey:* literally *be-persuaded-by;* the obedience of persuasion. Same word in Rom. ii. 8, Heb. xiii. 17, Jas. iii. 3, Acts v. 36f, 40, xxi. 14, xxiii. 21, xxviii. 24. *Obey truth:* yield to the persuasive influence of the Gospel, this looked upon in its general character as corresponding with eternal reality. The article before *truth* is omitted in Vat., Sinai, Alex. MSS.; and by all editors later than Lachmann: but is found in almost all other MSS. Its insertion is so easy, its omission so difficult, to explain, that we may accept with some confidence the testimony of the oldest copies. *That ye should not obey truth:* actual result, and therefore represented as the purpose, of the hindrance. *Persuasion:* a word similar in form to that rendered *obey;* and suggested by it. Grammatically, it might denote either a persuasive influence, or surrender to such. Probably, the former here. For this is an answer to the question in *v.* 7 about the source of the disobedience. They refused to be persuaded by Truth because they had yielded to another *persuasion*. Close parallel in Rom. ii. 8. But the difference is very slight. For, passive surrender implies active persuasion. The influence to which they yielded is *not from Him that calls you:* i.e. God, as in i. 6. The present tense implies that the Gospel voice is still sounding. Ch. i. 6 refers to a voice heard in days gone by.

9. Word for word as in 1 Cor. v. 6: see note. This suggests that it was a common proverb. Its application was so evident that Paul did not expound it. This proverb is in some sense a positive answer to *v.* 7. For it suggests that the source of the persuasion was small either in the number of the false teachers or in the apparent unimportance of their error. The latter is perhaps the more likely reference: for the importance of doctrine is more often overlooked than that of a few false teachers. In all ages, differences of doctrine have been held to be unimportant: whereas the influence of even one man has been felt to be great. The proverb also suggests that the result would be, as of many *little* things, silent, unobserved, yet pervasive and great. For the unseen *leaven* changes completely the nature of *the whole lump*. Paul thus calls attention, as does his protest in *v.* 3, to the importance of what seemed to the Galatians a small matter.

10. *I:* emphatic contrast. After speaking of the obedient persuasion his readers refuse to the Truth and of the persuasion which does not come from Him that calls them, Paul gives his own persuasion about the Galatian Christians. *In* the *Lord:* Rom. xiv. 14, Ph. i. 14, ii. 24, 2 Th. iii. 4. His confidence comes from union with the Master, and has Him for its surrounding element. *Minded:* same word in Rom. viii. 5, (see note,) and Ph. i. 7, ii. 2, 5, iii. 15. *No otherwise minded:* than Paul has just stated. He has a confidence about them which he feels to be ăn outflow of Christian life that, when they receive this letter, they will share his alarm about the influence of a little leaven and will recognise in the teaching of the disturbers an influence to be feared. This reveals Paul's confidence that this letter will have its designed salutary effect. It is almost the only gleam of light in the Epistle.

He that disturbs you: hardly sufficient (in the absence of any other indication: contrast *v.* 12, i. 7, vi. 12) to suggest one specially prominent man. Rather, Paul singles out any individual disturber who comes across his path and speaks of him personally. *Bear the judgment:* the sentence which will be pronounced upon disturbers, this looked upon as a heavy burden.

Notice that, as in 2 Cor. x. 2, 6, etc., Paul distinguishes his readers, to whom he speaks and for whom he has hopes, from the disturbers, about whom he writes but to whom he says nothing, thus indicating that for them he has no hope.

11. An abrupt question, which can be explained only as being a reply to a charge or insinuation, against Paul, of inconsistency. It is to us obscure because we do not know the charge which provoked it. *But I:* emphatic, in contrast to 'he that disturbs.' *Still preach:* as before his conversion. For *circumcision* was an essential element of that Judaism which Paul then so eagerly advocated. *Why still?* logical consequence; 'why do they go on persecuting me?' This question implies that the chief ground of the hostility of Paul's enemies was his denial that circumcision was binding on Gentiles. And naturally so. For they saw that this denial broke down the spiritual prerogative and monopoly which the Old Covenant gave to the Jewish nation.

Made-of-no-effect: shorn of results, as in iii. 17. *Then* (or *if so*) *is made, etc.:* correct inference from a false premiss, *if I still preach circumcision;* revealing its falsity: cp. 1 Cor. v. 10, vii. 14, xv. 14, 18. *The snare of the cross:* close coincidence

with 1 Cor. i. 23. The crucifixion of Christ led many to reject Him. It was therefore a trap in which they were caught. But Paul declares that if, while preaching the word of the cross, he still preaches the necessity of circumcision, then has the cross lost its power to hinder the faith of the Jews; in other words, that, if the shameful death of Christ is not inconsistent with the continued obligation of circumcision, i.e. with the continued prerogatives of Israel, it is no longer a difficulty to them. This implies that fear of the loss of spiritual pre-eminence lay at the root of that Jewish hatred to Jesus which took the form of bitter ridicule cast upon the mode of His death, a ridicule still recorded abundantly on the pages of ancient Jewish writers. Paul thus silently uncovers the wounded national pride which hid itself under the veil of refusal to believe in a crucified Messiah. His readers would understand the reference. See further under vi. 12.

12. A mere passing wish. The almost unknown Greek construction rather suggests that the wish will not be gratified. *Even*; introduces a very extreme wish. *Mutilate themselves*, or *cut themselves off*: used in the former sense, without any further explanation, in Dt. xxiii. 1 and Strabo, bk. xiii. p. 630, and Justin, 1*st Apology* ch. 27, "Some men mutilate themselves; and ascribe the mysteries to the mother of the gods," i.e. to the goddess Cybelé. This meaning is adopted here without question by Chrysostom and most Fathers. And it alone suits the extreme and unpractical form of this wish. Merely to desire the disturbers to leave the Church, would be an ordinary and moderate wish; and could not have been expressed in so remarkable a form. Of course, separation from the Church is included in Paul's desire. But this would follow at once from heathen mutilation. Self-mutilation in honour of Cybelé was practised at Pessinus in Galatia, which was indeed a chief seat of her worship. Paul wishes for a moment that the disturbers would go so far as to join the ranks of the heathen devotees around them. He thus compares circumcision with idolatrous mutilation. And rightly. For, although once commanded by God as a sign of His Covenant, yet to do it when no longer required, was but to imitate the needless self-inflictions of heathenism. *Unsettle*: same word in Acts xvii. 6, xxi. 38.

13*a*. A link binding § 19 to § 18, bringing Paul's teaching about freedom to bear on the matter of circumcision; and a stepping-stone to the mural teaching of § 20. *For ye*: in marked contrast to 'they that unsettle you.' The purpose of the Gospel summons

is that we may become and continue *free*. But the Law brings bondage to all who trust in it. From this bondage Christ died to save us. Therefore Paul is prompted to wish for a moment that they who are causing confusion by endeavouring to lead his readers back into bondage would push their own conduct to its logical result and adopt the hideous mutilations common around them. For, thus, Christians would be saved from their subtle and evil influence.

DIVISION II. is, as we learn from its contents, a disproof of the teaching of some Jewish Christians in Galatia, as at Antioch (Acts xv. 1) similar men taught, that 'Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved.'

Against this teaching Paul appeals to his readers' early Christian life, which was derived from faith and not from obedience to law; and to the similar case of Abraham, who obtained by faith his Covenant with God. The promise that in Abraham should all nations be blessed was a foresight of the Gospel: for only through Christ who bore for us the curse of the Law can it be fulfilled. To make its fulfilment contingent on obedience to the Law afterwards given, would destroy the real worth of the promise: which even human morality forbids. The purpose of the Law was to render salvation impossible except through faith, and thus to force us to Christ. But now this purpose has been accomplished: and by faith we are sons of God. We are, therefore, no longer under the Law. For it belongs to our spiritual childhood: and, now that the set time has come, we are free. The Galatian Christians, however, by their observance of sacred seasons show that they are turning back again to the rudiments of childhood. Paul fears lest his toil for them be in vain. And his fear prompts an earnest appeal. He remembers the warmth of his first reception in Galatia, and asks the reason of the change. He points silently to its authors; and exposes their secret and selfish motives.

The prominence given to the Mosaic Law by the disturbers suggests an appeal to its pages. In the family of Abraham were two sons: but only one was heir of the promise. So are there two Covenants of God with man. And the foregoing argument has shown that the children of the Old Covenant are, like those of Hagar, in bondage. But, in fulfilment of a joyous prophecy of Isaiah, there are now others, an unexpected offspring, who look up to Jerusalem as their Mother, to the free city above. Between

the children of the Old and of the New Covenant there is conflict. But, as of yore, the bondmen have no inheritance with the free born. And, because his readers are children of freedom, Paul warns them not to submit to a yoke of bondage.

In plain language Paul states the real significance and consequence of circumcision. To undergo it, is to accept the Law as a condition of God's favour: and, to do this, is to reject the work of Christ and the undeserved favour of God. In complete contrast to all trust in law, Paul cherishes a hope received by faith and from the Holy Spirit, which works in him love and its various manifestations. He warns his readers that an influence not from God is among them, and that a small beginning may be followed by wide-spread results. Yet he has confidence in them. The punishment will fall on the guilty person. Some men charge the Apostle with inconsistency in this matter of circumcision. But the hostility of the Jews disproves the charge. Indeed, their rejection of Christ crucified has its real ground in the overthrow of Jewish prerogatives involved in his death. So damaging is the influence of the disturbers that for the moment Paul almost wishes that they would relieve the Church of it by joining the ranks of the mutilated devotees of Cybelé.

DIVISION III.

CHRISTIAN MORALS.

CHAPTERS V. 13*b*—VI.

SECTION XX.

LOVE TO OUR NEIGHBOUR IS THE SUM OF THE LAW.

CH. V. 13*b*—15.

Ye were called for freedom, Brethren. Only use *not your freedom for an occasion for the flesh: but through love be servants one to another.* 14 *For the whole Law has been fulfilled in one word, in this, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."* (Lev. xix. 18.) 15 *But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed lest one by another ye be consumed.*

After doctrinal exposition follows, as its needful complement, moral teaching. Cp. Rom. xii. Indeed, Paul's exposition of the Law would be perilously incomplete if he did not show that it produces the highest morality. Oversight of this has again and again led, on the one hand to immorality, and on the other to rejection or mutilation of the teaching of Paul by those whose moral instinct assures them that morality is imperative. Hence Paul is compelled to add to the doctrinal teaching of DIV. II. the moral development of it in §§ 20, 21. To this he adds in § 22 sundry applications of the same. In § 23 he closes the Epistle by a few words from his own hand about its chief matter.

13*b*. Paul's passing wish in *v.* 12 that the disturbers would join the ranks of heathenism, he justified in *v.* 13*a* by recalling his teaching in § 18 that God designs His servants to be free. He did this that in § 20 he may defend Christian *freedom* from its most serious abuse. The word freedom thus becomes a stepping stone to his exposition of Christian morality.

Only; as in i. 23, iii. 2, vi. 12, gives special prominence to one thing. Cp. Ph. i. 27. *The freedom:* this definite liberty, to which God has called you. *An occasion:* as in Rom. vii. 8, 11, 2 Cor. v. 12, xi. 12; a point of departure for a course of activity. *The flesh:* the material constitution of our bodies, which determines in great measure our present bodily life, and seeks to rule us entirely; this looked upon collectively and in the abstract as one definite and active power. See note under Rom. viii. 11. The flesh ever seeks to gratify its own desires and to avoid what it dislikes. Paul warns us not, on the ground that obedience to law is no longer to us a means of obtaining God's favour, to surrender ourselves to the guidance of the flesh, as we shall do if we follow our own inclinations. He thus exposes a subtle foe ever present with us, and a very frequent and terrible abuse of justification by faith. This reference to *the flesh* prepares a way, as Paul's wont is, to the teaching of § 21. Moreover, gratification of bodily desires is essentially and utterly opposed to love, and indeed lies at the root of all selfishness. Therefore, before introducing the Law of Love, Paul warns against the greatest obstacle to it.

By love be-servants: exact opposite of *an occasion for the flesh. Love:* as in *v.* 6, where it is an outflow of faith. *Be-servants:* same word in iv. 25, Rom. vi. 6, vii. 6, 25, xiv. 18, xvi. 18. It denotes both the position, and the action, of a servant or slave. See under Rom. i. 1. As ordinarily used, the word

combines the ideas of bondage and of work done for another, both ideas being exemplified in the numerous slaves of Paul's day. Of these two ideas one or other frequently absorbs sole attention, leaving the other almost or quite out of sight. Hence the apparent variety in the use of the word and the apparent contradiction here. God has called us to Himself that we may be absolutely free, i.e. not hemmed in by outward restraint. Yet we love our brethren: and, prompted by this, we cannot but use all our powers for their good, as much as if we were their slaves. Such bondage is perfect freedom: for it is an unrestrained outflow of our own inmost and highest will. The apparent contradiction results from the poverty of human language. Only by using contradictory terms can we mark out the limits of our thoughts, and thus guard them from overstatement. Compare carefully similar language, evidently familiar to Paul, in Rom. vi. 18, 22, 1 Cor. ix. 19, 1 Pet. ii. 16.

14. *The whole Law:* of Moses, which contains Lev. xix. 18. *Has-been-fulfilled:* or *made-full:* same word in Rom. xiii. 8, viii. 4, Mt. i. 22, etc. Obedience to the whole Law has been embodied *in one word*, so that he who has obeyed this one precept has rendered all the obedience the Law requires. For all the commands of the Law are prohibitions of something contrary to love. (Cp. 1 Tim. i. 5.) This implies that even the ritual of the Mosaic Law is subordinate to this great command. And, to work in us love, which is the essence of God and involves all blessedness, is the ultimate aim (cp. Rom. viii. 4) of both the Law and the Gospel.

Verse 14 is a summary of Rom. xiii. 8—10: see my note. That Paul twice quotes Lev. xix. 18, reveals its importance to him. It is the complement of the twice quoted words in Hab. ii. 4, 'The righteous man will live by faith.' This precept is also quoted in Jas. ii. 8, thus forming a link between James and Paul; and in Mt. xxii. 39, Mk. xii. 31, Lk. x. 27, thus connecting the teaching of Paul and James with the recorded words of Jesus.

That the fulfilment of *THE LAW* is here given as a motive for conduct, proves that in some real sense the Law has abiding validity. This agrees with Rom. viii. 4, which says that fulfilment of the Law was a purpose of the mission of the Son of God. For, if so, the Law is an embodiment of God's will about us; and therefore a rule of life to His servants. This is true specially of the deep underlying principles of the Law of Moses, such as that

now before us. The mass of moral precepts belongs rather to the alphabet of morality. The ritual has abiding value as an expression of Gospel truth. Therefore, as in this verse, the Law may be quoted as a motive for Christian conduct.

All this does not contradict Paul's teaching in Rom. vii. 4, 6, vi. 14, Gal. iii. 25 that we are dead to the Law and no longer under its power. For, obedience to law is no longer to us the condition, and means of obtaining, the favour of God. Else we should never obtain it. For until God smiles upon us we cannot obey Him aright. In the midst of our sins and our moral helplessness we obtain pardon simply by belief of the good news of Him who died for sinners. Pardon is followed by the gift of the Holy Spirit to be in us the motive-power of a new life in harmony with the will of God, and therefore with the Law. Yet, as a condition of the favour of God and consequently an iron gate excluding us from it, the Law has utterly lost its power. In this sense it has completely passed away. The barrier has been broken down by Him who bore our curse and burst for Himself and us the bars of death.

On the other hand, the authority of the Law, which is strengthened immensely by the transcript of it in our hearts, prevents us from believing intelligently that God smiles upon us while we do what He forbids. Consequently, without obedience there can be no abiding faith; and therefore no abiding smile of God. But obedience is a result of His favour; and therefore cannot be a means of obtaining it. Between these views of obedience there is an infinite practical difference.

We see therefore that the Law is no longer a dread taskmaster under whose rule we tremble, but our Father's voice guiding our steps. And every precept is a promise of some good which our Father will work in us by His Spirit. Upon the ancient writing which condemned us has fallen light from the Cross of Christ: and the brightness of that light has changed its condemnation into promises of infinite blessing. It is now a lamp to our feet and a light to our path: and its statutes are our songs in the house of our pilgrimage.

To the advocates in Galatia of the abiding validity of the Law of Moses, this verse would come with special force.

15. Conduct exactly opposed to love. That the readers were in danger of it, this warning proves. *Bite:* like dogs or wild beasts. *And devour*, or *eat-up:* a further stage. Same word in 2 Cor. xi. 20, Mk. xii. 40, Rev. xi. 5. *Consumed:* ultimate

destruction. Same word in Lk. ix. 54. [The Greek present tenses describe the process; and the aorist, the result.] This verse suggests that the Judaizers had caused (cp. Acts xv. 2) bitter contention between church-members; and reveals the need of the moral teaching of *vv.* 13, 14. Paul warns his readers that, if they so far forget the Law of love as to act like wild beasts, they will thereby destroy their spiritual life and themselves.

SECTION XXI.

THE SPIRIT AND THE FLESH.

CH. V. 16—26.

And I say, Walk by the *Spirit, and* the *desire of* the *flesh ye will not fulfil.* [17] *For the flesh desires against the Spirit; and the Spirit against the flesh. For these are contrary, one to the other; in order that whatever things ye may wish these ye may not do.* [18] *But if ye are led by* the *Spirit, ye are not under law.* [19] *And manifest are the works of the flesh, which are fornication, uncleanness, wantonness,* [20] *idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, outbursts of fury, factions, divisions, parties,* [21] *envyings, drunkenness, revelling, and the things like these:* of *which I forewarn you, as I forewarned, that they who practise such things will not inherit* the *Kingdom of God.* [22] *But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faith,* [23] *meekness, self-control. Against such things there is no law.* [24] *And they that belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the emotions and the desires* of it. [25] *If we live by* the *Spirit, by* the *Spirit let us also walk.* [26] *Let us not become vainglorious, provoking one another, envying one another.*

After pointing to Love as the disposition of heart from which flows human morality, in contrast to self-surrender to the flesh, which is ever a source of enmity, Paul now still further traces Christian morality to its divine source, viz. the *Spirit* of God, whom he contrasts with the *flesh*. For the love described in § 20 is 'the love of the Spirit,' Rom. xv. 30. Already Paul has taught that God gives to His adopted sons the Spirit of the only begotten Son to evoke in them filial confidence in God. He now

teaches that the same Spirit will be the guide and strength of their life, neutralising in them the influence of the flesh and producing every form of moral good. In *vv.* 16, 17, he states the contrast of flesh and Spirit; and makes it more conspicuous by turning in *vv.* 18, 19—21, 22f, 24, 25 again and again (cp. Rom. i. 24—32) from one to the other. Of this comparison the words *Spirit* and *flesh* in *vv.* 5 and 13 are forerunners. He then concludes § 21 with a warning similar to, but milder than, the close of § 20.

16. *And I say:* as in iv. 1; cp. iii. 17. That Paul refers to the *Spirit* of the Son, is made quite certain by his constant teaching that He is the animating principle of the Christian life: cp. iv. 6, Rom. viii. 9, 1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19. This constant usage renders the article needless: cp. iii. 3, Rom. viii. 13. And the absence of the article directs us to the Holy Spirit in His abstract quality as an inward animating principle: so *vv.* 5, 18, 25; and *flesh* and *desire* here. *By* the *Spirit*: under His active influence, both guiding and strengthening; ideas involved in the word *Spirit*. So *vv.* 5, 18, 25, iii. 3, Rom. viii. 13, 14, Eph. i. 13; in all which passages the *Spirit* is much more than (Ellicott and Lightfoot here) "the metaphorical path, manner, or rule of action." He is the divine Agent of all Christian action. [Cp. Rom. iii. 24, 'by His grace;' 1 Cor. xv. 10, Eph. ii. 1, 5.] The Spirit guides us along a path corresponding to His own nature: hence the companion phrase, 'according to Spirit,' in Rom. viii. 4 *Walk:* cp. 2 Cor. xii. 18, Rom. viii. 4. 'Allow the Spirit to choose your steps.'

Desire is the chief feature of the *flesh: v.* 24, Eph. ii. 3, cp. Rom. vi. 12. In virtue of their common constitution, our bodies yearn for various objects needful or pleasant. See note under Rom. viii. 11. And these longings of the flesh do not distinguish right from wrong. Consequently, to yield to them, leads inevitably to sin. As in *v.* 13, the word *flesh* reveals the source of the contention condemned in *v.* 15. See notes under 1 Cor. iii. 3, Rom. viii. 11. *Fulfil*, or *accomplish:* same word in Rom. ii. 27. It denotes the attainment of a goal or aim. Cognate word in 2 Cor. xi. 15, see note; Rom. vi. 21f, 1 Cor. x. 11, 1 Tim. i. 5. If the Holy Spirit guides our steps, then will the tendencies inherent to the constitution of our bodies be prevented from working out their otherwise inevitable results. (See note under Rom. viii. 17.) For the Spirit of God, if we yield to His inward guidance, will by His own infinite power

defend us against the power of sin which seeks (Rom. vi. 12) to erect and maintain its throne in our bodies. Compare carefully Rom. viii. 13.

17. Supports *v.* 16 by restating, and further expounding, the above contrast. *Desires against:* absolute and mutual and active opposition of *the flesh* and *the Spirit.* The word *desires* is in itself neither good nor bad, and may therefore be supplied here as predicate of *the* Holy *Spirit;* as in Lk. xxii. 15 it is predicated of Christ, and in 1 Pet. i. 12 of angels. Cp. 1 Tim. iii. 1, Heb. vi. 11. The rendering *lust* (AV. and RV.) is therefore most unsuitable: for it cannot be predicated of the Spirit, and suggests an idea, viz. sin, not involved in the word. But since *desire* is a chief element in the practical influence of *the flesh*, and since in the flesh sin dwells and reigns, we read in the New Testament much more often of bad than of good desires. This implied desire of the Spirit makes the contrast of the two tendencies the more marked.

For these are opposed, etc.; supports the foregoing, by a restatement and further exposition. *In order that . . . ye may not do:* purpose of each of these opposing influences. If we wish to do a good thing, the desire of the flesh tends to lead us the opposite way: and conversely. This inherent tendency of the constitution of our bodies to hinder in us the work of the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit's contrary purpose, are motives for following in all things the guidance of the Spirit; and are an assurance that if we do so this evil tendency will not in us attain its goal. The essential hostility of the two principles compels us to choose sides: and there can be no doubt what our choice should be. Thus *v.* 17 supports *v.* 16.

We have here no trace of blame; and therefore no hint that these words are true only of immature Christians such as Paul's readers undoubtedly were. And the general terms, *the flesh* and *the Spirit*, suggest a universal truth. See under *v.* 24. The AV. 'so that ye cannot do,' etc., is a serious mistranslation. For it implies that the readers were not able to do what their better judgment approved; whereas Paul speaks only of opposite tendencies, leaving open the possibility of successfully resisting them.

18. Another reason for *v.* 16. *Led by the Spirit:* Rom. viii. 14: parallel and equal to 'walk by the Spirit,' but making more prominent the intelligent activity of the Spirit. *Under law:* as in iv. 4, 5, 21, Rom. vi. 14f, 1 Cor. ix. 20: no longer held in

bondage and condemnation under rules of conduct which we have already broken and are still unable to obey. This statement is proved in *v.* 23.

19—21. Catalogue of *the works of the flesh*, interrupting the argument of *v.* 18 to reveal by contrast the excellence of the fruit of the Spirit, which last proves that those 'led by the Spirit are not under law.' It is also a third reason for walking by the Spirit. *Manifest:* conspicuous before the eyes of men: see under Rom. i. 19. All can see for themselves that the following list is correct. *The works of the flesh:* various fulfilments of the 'desire of the flesh,' results of surrender to the influence of our bodily life. Cp. 'works of law' in ii. 16, cp. Rom. ii. 15; 'of the Lord,' 1 Cor. xvi. 10; 'of God,' Jno. ix. 3, vi. 28f; 'of faith,' 2 Th. i. 11. *Which are:* more correctly *to which class belong*, implying that the following list is not complete. Similar lists in Rom. i. 29, xiii. 13, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 2 Cor. xii. 20, Eph. v. 5, Col. iii. 5, 1 Tim. i. 9; Mk. vii. 21, Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15, 1 Pet. iv. 3. We note four divisions. (1) Sensuality, including *fornication*, intercourse with harlots; see under 1 Cor. v. 1: *uncleanness;* Rom. i. 24; anything inconsistent with personal purity: *wantonness;* Rom. xiii. 13; insolent and open disregard of all restraint. Same three words together in 2 Cor. xii. 21. The last forms a sort of climax. (2) *Idolatry:* and the closely related *sorcery*, the practice of magical arts; same word in Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15, ix. 21, xviii. 23, Ex. vii. 11, 22. (3) Various forms of discord. *Strife, jealousies, outbursts-of-fury, factions:* same words in same order in 2 Cor. xii. 20; see notes there and 1 Cor. iii. 3. *Parties:* same word in 1 Cor. xi. 18, the Greek original of our word 'heresy.' They who adopted error formed themselves in later ages, for the more part, into parties outside the Catholic Church. *Envy:* Rom. i. 29, Ph. i. 15, 1 Tim. vi. 4, Tit. iii. 3; Matt. xxvii. 18, Jas. iv. 5: mere vexation at others' good; a much worse word than *jealousy* which (see under 1 Cor. xii. 31) has good elements. (4) *Drunkenness* and *revelling* or riotous feasting: same words in Rom. xiii. 13; cp. 1 Pet. iv. 3. [The plurals in this passage denote various outbursts of drunkenness, etc.] *And the like:* added in a consciousness that even the above long list falls short of the infinite variety of sin.

This list begins with sins immediately prompted by the constitution of our bodies; then passes on to idolatry which rules men by gratifying their bodily desires; and to the collision with

others which results inevitably from the selfishness of such gratification, and against which Paul has in *v.* 15 just warned his readers; and concludes with another class of sins immediately prompted by the appetites of *the flesh*.

I forewarn, or *say-beforehand:* before the penalty is inflicted. Same word in 2 Cor. xiii. 2. *Forewarned:* on a previous visit to Galatia. Whether the second *fore-* contrasts Paul's former words with his words now or, like the first *fore-*, with their future fulfilment, is uncertain and unimportant. The previous word *forewarn* suggests slightly the latter reference. Paul reminds his readers that he is only repeating what he has said before. *Such things;* reminds us again (cp. *and the like* just above and *which sort of things* in *v.* 19) of the infinite variety of sin, reaching far beyond the long catalogue given. *Inherit the kingdom of God:* become, in virtue of filial relation to God, citizens of the future and glorious realm over which, in a royalty which His children will share, God will reign for ever. Same words in 1 Cor. vi. 10, xv. 50.

22, 23. A fourth argument for *v.* 16; also completing the argument of *v.* 18. *Fruit:* visible outgrowth of the unseen and mysterious vital force of the Holy Spirit. Cp. Rom. i. 13, vi. 21f, Eph. v. 9, Ph. i. 11, 22, Jas. iii. 18. The change from 'works of the flesh' to *the fruit of the Spirit* accords with Paul's use of the word *fruit* only for good results. The various virtues following form, in organic unity, each promoting the others, *the* one *fruit of the Spirit*. Similar catalogues in Col. iii. 12, 2 Tim. iii. 10.

Love: put first as the central principle of the Christian life. It is an outflow of the Spirit received through faith: iii. 14, v. 6. And it links § 21 to § 20. *Joy:* triumphant overflow of Christian gladness. Cp. 'joy in the Holy Spirit,' Rom. xiv. 17, 1 Th. i. 6. *Peace:* probably, as suggested by the words following, (cp. Rom. xiv. 17—19,) concord with others, in contrast to the discord of *v.* 20. *Longsuffering:* Eph. iv. 2, Col. iii. 12, 2 Tim. iii. 10, iv. 2: a long holding back of passion; 'slow to anger,' Jas. i. 19. A frequent attribute of God, Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22; as is *kindness*, Eph. ii. 7, a gentle mode of dealing with others. *Goodness:* doing good to others, by methods not necessarily gentle; Rom. xv. 14, Eph. v. 9, 2 Th. i. 11. *Faith:* probably faithfulness, a disposition on which others can rely, as in Rom. iii. 3. For, in its usual meaning, viz., assurance that God will fulfil His word, *faith* holds a unique place as the means by which we receive the Holy Spirit and *the* entire *fruit of the Spirit;* and is therefore not likely to

be classed as one among many elements of that fruit. *Meekness:* absence of self-assertion; see under 1 Cor. iv. 21. *Self-control:* Acts xxiv. 25, 2 Pet. i. 6; Sirach xviii. 29, "self-control of soul: after thy desires go not, and from thy passions refrain." A cognate verb in 1 Cor. vii. 9, ix. 25.

Against such things: in contrast to (*v.* 21) 'those who practise such things,' of whom the Law declares that they 'will not inherit the Kingdom of God.' Now, since the Spirit produces as His fruit dispositions which the Law does not condemn, they who (*v.* 18) 'are led by the Spirit are not under law.' The law is no longer a burden under which they groan. Just so, upright citizens think nothing of the criminal law; whereas to those who break or wish to break it, the same law is a terrible reality. Thus Paul completes the argument of *v.* 18 in support of *v.* 16. This deliverance from the Law by fulfilment of it (*v.* 14) was a purpose of the mission of the Son of God: Rom. viii. 4. The unexpected reference to the Law in *vv.* 14, 18, 23 reveals its large place in the thought of Paul.

24. Another argument in support of *v.* 16, viz. that to 'fulfil the desire of the flesh' is to renounce our own acceptance of the Christian life. *Belong to Christ Jesus*, or literally (RV.) *are of Christ Jesus:* 1 Cor. iii. 23, 2 Cor. x. 7; cp. 1 Cor. iii. 4. They stand in special relation to Christ as His servants, disciples, members of His body, etc. *Crucified:* as in ii. 20, vi. 14, Rom. vi. 6. Notice three crucifixions in this Epistle; of Paul, of the flesh and its desires, and of the world. Each of these implies the others. In each case *crucified* denotes death in virtue of Christ's death on the cross and by union with the *Crucified:* cp. ii. 20 with *v.* 19; vi. 14 with Col. ii. 20. *The flesh* is dead, i.e. its life, or in other words its activity and power, has come to an end: see note under Rom. vii. 8, and compare carefully Rom. vi. 6 and my note. *They have crucified the flesh*, by their own act: for the destruction of the power of the flesh resulted from their own self-surrender and faith. See note under 2 Cor. vii. 1. *The emotions:* same word in same sense in Rom. vii. 5: elsewhere it denotes suffering, as in 2 Cor. i. 5ff. Compare our word 'passion,' which combines both meanings. Objects around first produce in us *emotions*, in which the mind is chiefly passive, acted upon from without: these, taking practical and active direction towards the objects which produce them, become *desires*. Desires are a constant accompaniment of *flesh* so long as it has vitality: and *emotions*

are the beginning of *desires*. Paul declares that, *together with the flesh* these *emotions and desires* have, by self-surrender to Christ and by union with His death, altogether lost their power.

The categorical statement of *v.* 24, like Paul's statements about himself in ii. 20, vi. 14, can be no less than a description of the ideal and normal Christian life, i.e. of the life which God designs us to live and which He is ready to work in us from this moment by His own infinite power and in proportion to our faith. At first sight this statement seems inconsistent with *v.* 17. For if the flesh has desire and purpose, it must be alive, whereas here Paul implies that it is dead. But this inconsistency is but the poverty of human language, which often compels us to state opposite sides of the same truth in terms apparently contradictory. Each statement admits an interpretation in harmony with the other. The flesh is still alive in the sense that it exerts upon us an influence towards forbidden objects which can be effectually resisted only by the presence of the Spirit of God within us. And this is a reason for following ever the guidance of the Spirit. On the other hand, if in all things we accept His guidance, this hostile influence of the flesh will be neutralised so completely that it will no longer influence our conduct or defile our thoughts. And, in view of this complete victory which Christ has gained for us by His death, and which God is ready to work now, in all who venture to believe His promise, by joining them to the Crucified One, Paul says correctly that to those who belong to Christ the flesh and its desires have passed away, that their life has altogether ceased. By so saying he greatly helps our faith to grasp and appropriate the victory here described. The discrepancy is not greater than that between ii. 20, 'I live in the flesh' and Rom. viii. 9, 'ye are not in the flesh.'

Notice that just as the flesh is the link uniting us to the material world around and the medium through which, by its susceptibility to material influences and by its desire for material objects, the world acts upon us, so it is also the link uniting the unsaved to sin and the avenue through which operate the evil influence and the domination of the material world. Christ died in order that by His death this link may be practically broken and this avenue closed, that by union with the Crucified we may be set free from this influence and bondage. Virtually, we were set free when Christ died: formally, when we joined His Church: actually, when, and so far as, we venture to believe that this inward crucifixion is already ours.

25. Concluding argument in support of *v.* 16, which verse it recalls. It is a practical application of the foregoing doctrinal teaching. *By the Spirit:* as in *v.* 16; under the influence of the Holy Spirit acting upon us from within as an animating principle. *If we live by the Spirit:* an assumed fact: for He is in us the breath of immortal life. Therefore, Paul says, we should allow Him to direct our steps. For, in proportion as we yield to His influence, will the life He imparts be rich. Similar thought in Rom. viii. 2: for 'the law of the Spirit' is the Holy Spirit guiding our action; and since He has made us free from the law of sin and of death, He is to us 'the Spirit of life.' *Walk:* different from the word in *v.* 16, but found in vi. 16, Rom. iv. 12, Ph. iii. 16, Acts xxi. 24; all very instructive parallels. It calls attention to the path in which we walk.

26. Steps in which the Spirit will never guide us, a negative specific application of the doctrinal teaching of § 21 and a transition to the positive specific application of the same in § 22. This application was prompted doubtless by the disposition in the readers which suggested the similar application (*v.* 15) of § 20. *Vainglorious:* Ph. ii. 3, cherishing empty opinions about ourselves: further expounded in vi. 3. From this root spring as offshoots mutual provocation and envy. Paul warns against both root and offshoots. [The present subjunctive suggests that the vainglory was already creeping in.] *Provoking* (or *challenging*) *one another:* a frequent outcome of *envy*, i.e. of vexation at the superiority of others.

SECTION 21 implies that the great contrast of *flesh* and *Spirit*, so familiar to Paul, (cp. Rom. viii. 4—13,) a contrast underlying and pervading both the natural and the moral constitution of man, is also the basis of his moral probation. See notes under Rom. viii. 11, and 17.

The flesh is the visible side of man, animated matter. Mysteriously pervading it, preserving it from corruption and giving to it growth and well-being, is the invisible spirit. Thus in man meet, and at every point interpenetrate, the seen and unseen worlds; the one destined to crumble soon into its original dust, the other created for endless life. We have thus the unseen world within us, actually present to our inmost consciousness. Now each of these elements claims to rule our entire action and to mould our inner life. And they are in absolute opposition. The flesh, acting upon us through desires aroused by material objects around, tends to beget various kinds of actions, many of them

indisputably bad. Such actions will exclude us from the glory of the coming kingdom. But in absolute opposition to the flesh is the one Spirit of God, whom God has given to dwell in the hearts of His people, that thus their spirit may have (Rom. viii. 10) immortal life, and to be in them an all-wise guide. The Spirit is the living and divine seed from which springs a harvest of moral excellence. This excellence is all that the Law requires. Consequently, for those under His influence the Law has no terrors. And in proportion as they follow His guidance is the life which He imparts rich and strong.

The evil influences of the flesh are still a power against which the Christian must needs be ever on his guard. But his warfare is shared by the Spirit of God, against whom even the flesh is powerless. Consequently, the presence of the Spirit in our hearts has already in us put an end, as we abide in faith, to the rule of the flesh. We may therefore say that in us, through the death of Christ, the flesh itself is already dead, that our old selves and our old life have been buried in His grave. All this is abundant reason for complete self-surrender to the guidance of the Spirit. He will inspire that love which is fulfilment of the Law, and which alone will save Christian liberty from degenerating into hurtful licence.

Notice the massive simplicity and grandeur of Paul's double foundation of Christian morality. He lays down first the one precept of love, in the very words of the ancient Law, a precept including all others. But even this, if it stood alone, would but reveal our inability to do what God requires, and thus condemn us. Paul therefore invokes the Spirit, the seed divine from which grows, by its unseen and mysterious vitality, the fruit of love and of all virtue. A specimen of the superstructure this foundation is capable of supporting, Paul will erect for us in § 22.

SECTION XXII.

SPECIAL APPLICATIONS.

CH. VI. 1—10.

[1]Brethren, if a man be even overtaken in some trespass, ye spiritual ones restore such a one in the *Spirit of meekness, looking to thyself lest also thou be tempted. [2]Bear one another's burdens; and thus fulfil the law of Christ. For if an one*

thinks himself to be something, while he is nothing, he deceives his own mind. 4*But let each one prove his own work: and in reference to himself alone he will have his ground of exultation, and not in reference to another man.* 5*For each one will bear his own load.*

6*Let him that is instructed in the word take part with him that instructs, in all good things.* 7*Be not deceived: God is not mocked. For whatever a man sows, this he will also reap.* 8*Because he that sows for his own flesh, will from the flesh reap corruption: and he that sows for the Spirit will from the Spirit reap eternal life.* 9*Moreover, in doing well let us not fail. For in due season we shall reap, if we do not faint.* 10*Therefore, as we have opportunity let us do good towards all men, and especially towards those of the household of the faith.*

Already, in v. 26, Paul has given a negative application of the teaching of § 21. This is now followed by sundry positive applications of §§ 20 and 21, chiefly in the direction of mutual help.

1. *Brothers;* introduces suitably an appeal for brotherly aid. *Overtaken:* as though the evil deed, i.e. strong temptation to it, had come suddenly upon him; and he had been surprised into sin. Paul thus softens the case he supposes. *Trespass:* Rom. iv. 25, v. 15ff: a moral fall. *Ye, the spiritual ones:* 1 Cor. ii. 15, iii. 1: men under the influence of the Holy Spirit, in contrast to the man who has fallen. This title recalls the special teaching of § 21. Each reader would judge whether it describes himself; and is here reminded of the obligation it involves. Cp. Rom. xv. 1, Ph. iii. 15. *Restore:* so as to be again fully equipped for the service of God: same word in 1 Cor. i. 10, see notes. [The present tense here and in 2 Cor. xiii. 11, pictures the restoration as gradual.] Paul bids his fellow-Christians aid the recovery of their fallen brother. *In* the *Spirit of meekness:* 1 Cor. iv. 21: the Holy Spirit, as the unseen root and seed (v. 23) of meekness, and as the all-surrounding element of Christian correction. The conspicuous place of the Holy Spirit in § 21 permits no other exposition. The inserted word *Spirit* was suggested probably by *spiritual.* Never are we in greater peril of undue self-assertion, and therefore in greater need of *meekness,* than in reproving others. For their fall evokes in us a sense of superiority. How deeply Paul felt this, we learn here and in 1 Cor. iv. 21, 2 Cor. x. 1, 2 Tim. ii. 25. *Looking:* more fully, *looking with a purpose:* see note, 2 Cor. iv. 18. The purpose is immediately

stated. *Tempted:* our loyalty to Christ subjected to a test: see under 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 1 Cor. vii. 5. These words further soften the supposed case by suggesting that if others had been similarly tempted they might also have fallen. A remembrance of this will mingle meekness with our reproof. The change from *ye* to *thou* suggests how personal and solitary is temptation. In the hour of trial we stand or fall alone.

The exceptional case suggested in this verse implies the moral soundness of the Galatian Christians generally, in striking contrast to the doctrinal unsoundness which evoked in Paul fear lest his labours for them should be in vain. This implies further that morality, apart from correct doctrine, is not sufficient for the vitality of a Church.

2. *Burdens:* literally *heavy-weights:* same word in 2 Cor. iv. 17, Mt. xx. 12, Acts xv. 28, Rev. ii. 24, 1 Th. ii. 6. *One-another's:* emphatic, in contrast to bearing only our own burdens. *Bear:* same word in same sense in Rom. xv. 1. Verse 1 suggests that Paul refers chiefly to loving and intelligent sympathy with a fallen brother, making his spiritual loss our own loss and sorrow, and using our powers to raise him when pressed down under a consciousness of his own sin. An example of such sympathy, we find in 2 Cor. xi. 29. These words imply that this sympathy and aid may involve us in difficulties, like the carrying of a heavy *burden;* and exhort us to submit to such for our brother's good. *The law of Christ:* the rule of conduct supported by His authority; cp. 'the Law of Moses' in Lk. ii. 22, xxiv. 44, Jno. vii. 23, Acts xiii. 39, xv. 5, xxviii. 23. It refers evidently to the precept quoted in v. 14. And the phrase confirms the historical correctness of Mt. xxii. 39, etc., where Christ is recorded to have paid to this precept special honour. *Fulfil:* or, *fill up to the full:* same strong word in 1 Th. ii. 16, 'fill up their sins;' 1 Cor. xvi. 17, Ph. ii. 30. To sympathise with, and endeavour to raise, the fallen, is a genuine mark of Christian love. Just as the words 'spiritual' and 'spirit' bring to bear upon the exhortation of *v.* 1 the teaching of § 21; so this phrase brings to bear upon it the teaching of § 20. Thus Paul exemplifies each of these foundation principles of Christian morality.

3. *To be something:* of intrinsic worth: same words in ii. 6; cp. Acts v. 36. *He being nothing:* a suggestion which each reader would test in reference to his own case. It was Paul's judgment about himself: 2 Cor. xii. 11. The wisest and best cannot in the least degree, by his own skill or strength, avoid the

perils which surround him and attain his highest interest. To think we can, is to inflict on ourselves *mental-deception:* a word akin to this last, in Tit. i. 10; cp. Jas. i. 26.

By making *v.* 3 a reason for *v.* 2, Paul suggests the all-important lesson that an inflated self-estimate makes us careless about the burdens of others, and thus hinders us from fulfilling the law of love. Similar teaching is suggested in v. 26, 1 Cor. iv. 6, v. 2. Vainglory is a subtle and dangerous form of selfishness; and always obscures moral vision and weakens brotherly affection. There is therefore no need to join *v.* 3 to *v.* 1, making *v.* 2 a sort of parenthesis: and the importance of *v.* 2 forbids this.

4. *His own work:* looked upon as one whole, (cp. 1 Cor. iii. 13ff, ix. 1,) including (2 Cor. xi. 15) various 'works.' Conspicuous contrast to the mental hallucination of *v.* 3. *Prove:* test with good intent; see under 2 Cor. xiii. 5. Paul bids us, instead of indulging in vain subjective dreams, to put to the test, and thus discover the worth of, the total objective result of our labours. *And then;* emphasises the above exhortation as the condition of what follows. *Exultation:* see under Rom. ii. 17. *Ground-of-exultation in-reference-to:* similar words in same sense in Rom. iv. 2. We are all prone to indulge in an exultation based upon a comparison of ourselves with others who seem to be inferior to us. A conspicuous example of this, was the Pharisee of Lk. xviii. 11. All such exultation is delusive: for the inferiority of others is no measure of our absolute worth. But a consideration of God's *work* in us and through our agency, leaving out of sight all comparison with others, may justly give rise to deep gratitude and exultant joy that He has condescended to use us as agents of good: for all such is exultation in God. Of this, a conspicuous example is Paul himself: cp. Rom. xv. 17, 1 Cor. ix. 15f, 2 Cor. i. 12, xi. 10. Moreover, if we limit our exultation to actual results, (*each one his own work,*) our exultation will frequently be turned into deep self-abasement. In 2 Cor. x. 12—18 we find the same thought as in this verse, more fully developed.

5. *Load:* something to be carried, whether heavy or light; akin to a verb denoting 'to carry.' Hence we have, with the same word, both light and heavy loads: Mt. xi. 30; xxiii. 4, Lk. xi. 46. It thus differs from the word in *v.* 2, of which the chief idea is heavy weight. In Acts xxvii. 10, it denotes a ship's cargo. Paul's exhortation to cease comparing ourselves with others and look at ourselves alone, he now supports by saying that there is a load from which no one can release us, a *load* of

his own which in spite of all brotherly help *each one will himself bear*. This is the solitary side of every one's Christian life. Remembrance of it should deter us from compafisons with others, all which overlook our solitary personal responsibility. And, that the help we can render is thus limited, should move us to render to our brethren all the help we can.

6. From a specific exhortation in *v.* 1 to aid the fallen, Paul passed on in *v.* 2 to a more general exhortatiun to help the burdened ones, and supported this in *v.* 3 by a warning against inflated self-estimate and in *v.* 4 by a suggestion that each test his own work apart from comparison with others and in view (*v.* 5) of his own personal and solitary responsibility. He now goes a step further from the specific to the general, by bidding all his readers, whom he divides into two all-inclusive classes, to join together in doing every kind of good. *Let-him-take-part*, or *be-partner-with:* either join with others in some action, or share with them something belonging to them or to him. Same or cognate word in Rom. xii. 13, xv. 26f, 1 Cor. i.9, x. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 14, viii. 4, ix. 13, xiii. 13. *Instructed:* the Greek original of the English word 'catechumen:' same word in Rom. ii. 18, 1 Cor. xiv. 19, Lk. i. 4, Acts xviii. 25, xxi. 21, 24. From the standpoint of *v.* 5, Paul looks at each one, *instructed* or *instructing*, singly: cp. *v.* 1. The simple term, *the word*, (Col. iv. 3, 1 Th. i. 6,) reveals the unique grandeur of the Gospel as the one Word of God and of life. *Him that instructs:* including Paul himself and all those who, church-officers or others, exercise the gift of teaching. This division of church-members implies that regular instruction was even then a part of church order. *All good things:* either material good, as in Lk. i. 53, xii. 18f, xvi. 25; or good actions, especially beneficence, as always with Paul, e.g. *v.* 10, Rom. x. 15; ii. 10, vii. 13, viii. 28, ix. 11, xii. 9, 21, xiii. 3f, xiv. 16, xv. 2, xvi. 19. The plural number suggests the variety of good things. To these belong (1) the restoration of the fallen and (2) the bearing of others' burdens. This exhortation is included in the final exhortation of *v.* 10. Paul intimates that they who teach others must practise good things; and that in this they are to be joined by their pupils.

Following Chrysostom and Jerome, many expositors suppose that *all good things* denotes liberal maintenance for Christian teachers; chiefly on the ground that the word rendered *take-part* has the sense of Christian liberality in three of four other

places in Paul's Epistles, and that not otherwise can we account for the unexpected mention here of the teachers and the taught. But it is inconceivable that Paul would touch for a moment, in language altogether indefinite and ambiguous, and then leave, a matter so definite and specific, and one of which there is no hint in the foregoing or following context. Moreover, the tremendous warning of *v.* 7 leads us to expect in *v.* 6 some indication of an error or peril proportionately great, as we find in the other places where similar though less solemn language is used; and a correction of the error in the words following, i.e. in *vv.* 7*b*, 8. Again, the maintenance of those set apart from secular work to serve the Church is not liberality but payment of a just debt. It is most unlikely that Paul would urge his readers to this duty by bidding them share with their teachers all their earthly goods. Indeed, he seems rather to dissuade from having many paid teachers in the infant Church. Although claiming for himself and others a right to be paid, he refused (1 Cor. ix. 15) to assert his claim; and in this he was setting (2 Th. iii. 9) an example for others. Once only (1 Tim. v. 17f) apparently, near the close of his life, Paul refers to the maintenance of ordinary church-teachers. And, in the absence of other proof, this general and sweeping exhortation cannot be accepted as evidence that such teachers were supported in the Churches of Galatia. For it gives good sense, as shown in the above exposition, without supposing any such reference.

Paul divided his readers into teachers and taught in order perhaps to say that restoration of the fallen and help for the burdened must not be left to the shepherds of the flock, but that all must join in all such works of mercy. That the metaphor of seed (*v.* 7) refers in 1 Cor. ix. 11, 2 Cor. ix. 6 to liberality, has little weight: for it is very common in various applications. And the tremendous language which introduces the metaphor suggests that Paul was thinking of something more solemn than maintenance of Christian teachers.

The spread of the other exposition is easily explained by its usefulness to Church authorities.

7. *Be not deceived:* 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 33, in each case introducing a safeguard against a serious moral error referred to in the foregoing words: cp. Jas. i. 16. *Is-not-mocked:* treated with open ridicule and contempt: same word in Prov. i. 30, xv. 20, Job xxii. 19, Ps. lxxx. 6, Jer. xx. 7, 1 Macc. vii. 34, 2 Macc. vii. 39. It implies that to disregard what follows is

outrageous iasult to God, and declares solemnly that such insult God will not tolerate. Verse 7*b* justifies this solema protest, by statiag a great principle worthy of it. *He will also reap:* same words in 2 Cor. ix. 6, referriag to the measure of the harvest. But here Paul refers to its kiad. If we sow wheat, we shall reap wheat, etc. A universal principle of widest application, viz. that actions are seeds reappearing in a harvest of results, by the outworking of their own organic laws, to be their authors' abiding possession. Thus (cp. 2 Cor. v. 10) a man's own actions become, in their developed consequences, their own exact retribution. Same favourite metaphor in 2 Cor. ix. 6, where see notes, 1 Cor. ix. 11, Jas. iii. 18, Job iv. 8, Ps. cxxvi. 5, Hosea viii. 7.

8. Restatemeat of the metaphor of *v.* 7 in view of the contrast of *the flesh* and *the Spirit* asserted aad expounded in § 21. The metaphor was iatroduced *because* two widely different harvests are possible.

[The all-important Greek word *eis*, which I have here rendered *for*, (see under Rom. i. 1,) denotes in its simple local sense movement towards the inside of something, e.g. i. 17 'into Jerusalem, Arabia, Damascus,' iv. 6 'into our hearts;' then a teadency of action whether desired or not, e.g. iv. 24, 'brings forth children for bondage;' and is a favourite word for mental direction, or purpose, i.e. for the aim of action, some desired object towards which the actor looks, e.g. ii. 8, 'for apostleship . . . for the Gentiles.' Sometimes, as in vi. 4 'in reference to himself alone,' it is still less definite noting merely a point of view from which an object is regarded. But in every case it denotes direction, either of actual movement, or tendeacy, or thought.]

Io the words *for his own flesh* Paul forsakes the form of his metaphor in order to describe more clearly and fully the reality underlying it. Had he continued the form adopted in *v.* 7, he would have written 'he that sows carnal things will also reap carnal things.' But he describes the only two kinds of action and result possible to men not (as in *v.* 7) by their nature but by their aim, suggesting that this is the true test of conduct. Yet he retains the words *sow* and *reap* to keep before us the great truth that, by the outworking of their own nature, actions will reappear, multiplied, in their results. *The flesh:* not the organized body with its various members; but the material constitution of the body, common to men aad aaimals and

desiring (v. 16) various material objects needful or pleasant to it. The seeds sown *for the flesh* are actions designed to gratify desires prompted by bodily life. *His own flesh;* suggests the essential selfishness of these desires. *From the flesh:* or *out of the flesh:* same transition of prepositions in Rom. i. 17. If to gratify our *own flesh* be our aim, the flesh will be to us a source of *corruption*. For corruption is inseparable from flesh of all kinds: by its own nature it goes to ruin, and in repulsive forms. For this reason (1 Cor. xv. 50: cp. *v.* 42) it cannot enter the kingdom of God. It is needless to say that Paul refers here to the ruin of eternal death. On the principle that a man's actions will reappear in their results, Paul declares that they who choose as their aim gratification of the flesh will as an appropriate and inevitable consequence receive back from the flesh that corruption which essentially belongs to it.

It is useless and needless to make this important and clear teaching fit in at all points with the metaphor of seed and harvest. See under Rom. xi. 24. All suggestions about different fields in which the seed is sown fail utterly: for the kind of harvest depends not on the field but on the seed. The metaphor simply teaches that actions, like seeds, reproduce themselves in their results. This great truth justifies and satisfies the metaphor. *The Spirit*, can be no other than the Spirit of God, as throughout DIV. III. Like the material of our bodies, He claims that the aim of our life be to follow His guidance and to work out His purposes. To act with this in view, is to *sow for the Spirit*. And such action will, in virtue of the essential nature of the Spirit, be followed by *eternal life*. For He is 'the Spirit of life' who makes 'free from the law of sin and of death.' Cp. Rom. vi. 21—23, where, without the metaphor, we have the same thought.

In this verse Paul teaches that the consequences of actions, and therefore their moral worth, are determined by their aim: a truth indisputable and of the highest importance. Many actions in themselves good are yet, because of a selfish aim, universally condemned and despised. By associating this truth with the metaphor of seed and harvest, Paul teaches that the consequences which follow different aims do so by organic and essential laws of human action. And he places the same truth in a more conspicuous light by deviating in some measure, in order to assert it in plainest terms, from a favourite metaphor.

9. Another point in the same subject, viz. continuance, even

under difficulties. *Well-doing:* or *doing the excellent thing*, that which is morally beautiful. Same word in Rom. vii. 21. *Fail:* turn out badly in something, lose heart and give up through weariness or fear; as in 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16. It suggests that circumstances may arise to test our perseverance. *In due season:* literally *in* its *own season*, the set time when, in virtue of the laws of the moral world, the seed will produce fruit. *Faint not:* through failure in spiritual strength. The parallel term *fail* denotes rather failure in Christian courage. Each term involves the other: for the brave heart will find strength. We have no hint that Paul refers to the weariness of sowing: and toil is not specially conspicuous in the sower. Certainly he does not refer to the weariness of harvest: for in the eternal harvest there will be no toil.

10. Practical inference, summing up § 22. *As we have, etc.:* let our action correspond with our *opportunity*. [ὡς combines here the senses of *inasmuch as* and *while:* cp. Jno. xii. 35, 36. For, although grammatically it merely denotes that the *opportunity* is looked upon from the speaker's subjective point of view, yet evidently the opportunity is mentioned as a motive, and as one which will last only for a time.] *Opportunity:* same word as *season* in *v.* 9. The harvest has a season of its 'own,' and so has the sowing. *Do good*, literally *work the good:* same words in Rom. ii. 10, Eph. iv. 28. Contrast Rom. xiii. 10. It suggests the labour of doing good. *Good:* including (*v.* 1) the restoration of the fallen brother, bearing (*v.* 2) the burdens of others, joining (*v.* 6) with teachers in all good works, sowing (*v.* 8) for the Spirit, and (*v.* 9) continuing in all this without weariness. *To* (or *towards*) *all men:* the direction of our beneficence. *They of the household of faith,* or *those belonging to the house of faith:* same word in Eph. ii. 19, 1 Tim. v. 8; in 1 Sam. x. 14 for a male domestic servant, and in Lev. xviii. 6, 12f, 17 for relatives in blood or law. The word is sometimes used in a more general sense for any close relationship; and for those who devote themselves to some special matter, e.g. γεωγραφίας οἰκεῖος, belonging to the household of geography, in Strabo bk. i. p. 13. But here it reminds us that the Church is the house (1 Tim. iii. 15, Heb. iii. 6, x. 21, 1 Pet. iv. 17) and family of God. Paul bids us use *towards all* within our reach the *opportunity* which *we* all *have* of *doing good;* and recalls the special claim of our companions in the household bound together by our common faith.

In § 22 Paul illustrates the two great principles of Christian

morality expounded in §§ 20 and 21 respectively, by applying them to the mutual intercourse of members of a Christian Church. These he exhorts to show Christian love by bearing burdens one for another, e.g. by restoring any one who has fallen; and warns against inflated self-estimate, a chief hindrance to mutual help, urging rather a reasonable estimate of each one's own work and independent responsibility. This thought reminds Paul that life is a seed time to be followed by harvest, a truth which he applies to the two principles of action expounded at length in § 21, the Flesh and the Spirit; as already while speaking of a brother's fall he has pointed to the Spirit as the source of the meekness needful in those who try to restore him. And upon all his readers, teachers and taught, he urges good doing of all kinds; and patient continuance therein. While all men have a claim to help, our fellow Christians have a special claim.

DIVISION III. is the needful complement of the doctrine of Justification by Faith asserted in its native ruggedness in DIV. II. This doctrine, Paul does not qualify by expounding at length what he means by faith and by justification, lest by so doing he should weaken its force or perplex his readers; but guards it from abuse by placing beside it the moral teaching of DIV. III.

Although none can, by good works, obtain the favour of God, and although all who believe the Gospel are already sons of God and heirs of His kingdom, yet from that kingdom will be excluded all who commit sin and consciously or unconsciously make self-indulgence the aim of life. This plainly asserted truth makes intelligent belief of the Gospel promise impossible except to those who earnestly resolve to forsake sin. On the other hand, the immovable certainty of the promise assures us that God will work in us the victory over sin needful for its fulfilment. In this way we have a practical harmony of these all-important doctrines. And neither of them invalidates or dilutes the other. This harmony is further discussed in Diss. vi.

Christian morality is here made to rest on two massive pillars: (1) the great commandment which in the Mosaic Law sums up our whole duty to our fellows, viz. to love them as ourselves; and (2) the Christian doctrine that the Holy Spirit given to those who believe the Gospel seeks to guide their steps and is essentially hostile to the influences of bodily life. These great principles of morality Paul expounds; and in a few words gives examples, both general and in detail, of their application to matters of daily life.

SECTION XXIII.

THE ADVERSARIES ARE INSINCERE.

CH. VI. 11—16.

See with how large letters I have written to you with my own hand. 12 *So many as wish to look well in* the *flesh, these are compelling you to receive circumcision; only in order that they may not, through the cross of Christ, be persecuted.* 13 *For neither do they who are receiving circumcision themselves keep law. But they wish you to receive circumcision, in order that in your flesh they may exult.* 14 *But far from me be it to exult except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; through which to me* the *world is crucified, and I* crucified *to* the *world.* 15 *For neither circumcision is anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.* 16 *And so many as walk by this rule peace* be *upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.*

11. *With how large letters:* so RV. This rendering is determined by the Greek dative which denotes the instrument with which Paul wrote, viz. large characters, not the epistles written; by the word rendered *large* which denotes not number but size, whereas a long epistle would involve merely the number of characters used; and by Paul's constant use (17 times) of another word, the Greek original of our word 'epistle,' to denote a written communication. That *v.* 11 refers to *vv.* 11—18, and not to the foregoing Epistle, is suggested by Paul's custom of adding to each Epistle (2 Th. iii. 17, 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Col. iv. 18) a short autograph, as a mark of genuineness and perhaps also as an expression of warm friendship. If so, the past tense, *I-have-written*, may have been suggested to Paul by the four preceding words lying already written before him while writing this word; and by easy transition of thought to his readers' point of view. Cp. 'sent,' in Acts xv. 27, xxiii. 30. But we cannot safely quote Philem. 19, 21 as examples: for these refer in each case to foregoing words. The general usage of the Greek language forbids us to accept the word *I-have-written* as proof that the whole Epistle was written in large characters by Paul's own hand. And his custom suggests that only this closing paragraph was so written. The size of the letters used proclaims, like capitals in modern printing, the earnestness of this concluding summary of the foregoing Epistle.

12. *To-look-well:* literally *to-put-on-a-good-face;* cp. ii. 6, 2 Cor. v. 12, x. 7, Mt. xvi. 3. *In*-the-*flesh:* in outward bodily life, the element of the desired good appearance. *Are-compelling-you:* so ii. 3: by proclaiming (Acts xv. 1) that in order to be saved you must be circumcised; and by a personal influence which the Galatian Christians seemed unable to resist. [The Greek presents in *vv.* 12, 13 direct attention to a process going on, but which Paul hopes to stay. So i. 6, iii. 3, v. 3, 4.] *That they may not be persecuted:* their *only* aim. *For the cross of Christ:* on the ground that they preach a crucified Messiah. A close parallel in v. 11. It implies that the seducers were professed Christians; that of Christian teaching the death of Christ was an essential and conspicuous element; and that this element (cp. 1 Cor. i. 23) was the professed ground of the Jews' hostility to the Gospel. But that the seducers hoped to escape persecution on this ground by proclaiming the necessity of circumcision, suggests that the real ground of the Jews' opposition was that the Gospel overturned the exclusive spiritual prerogatives claimed by them under the Old Covenant, of which covenant circumcision was a conspicuous element; and that their scorn of the Crucified One was chiefly a means of pouring contempt on those who were breaking down, by a Gospel free for all men, the Jewish wall of partition. And we can well conceive the mass of the Jews looking with indifference or with favour on a profession of Christianity which did not interfere with, but rather exalted, their fancied spiritual pre-eminence. Possibly, the early success of the Gospel at Jerusalem (Acts ii. 41, iv. 4, vi. 1) was aided by oversight, on the part of all concerned, of the logical consequence of the Gospel so boldly preached by Jews and so numerously accepted.

The word *only* implies that the men referred to cared nothing for circumcision in itself, (or for the Old Covenant,) that their apparently eager advocacy of it was *only* a means by which they hoped to escape persecution while yet remaining members of the Church of Christ. To believe in Him while preaching circumcision, was thus a safe and cheap form of religion. Such an aim Paul properly calls a desire to make a good appearance in outward bodily life, i.e. in that side of life which is under the eyes of men around. And since their aim was to avoid, while yet believing the Gospel and thus as they vainly thought securing the blessings of the life to come, the bodily hardship and peril which otherwise Jewish hostility might cause them, their conduct

was really a sowing for the flesh, and their actions were works of the flesh. For, protection of the body was to them a guiding principle. Paul thus reveals the secret and unworthy thought of the seducers, and brings to bear upon it (hence the word *flesh*) the teaching of §§ 21, 22. And this personal and skilful application reveals still further the appropriateness and value of that teaching.

The men referred to here were probably Jewish Christians chiefly. For such were most likely to press Gentile converts to be circumcised, and to look upon this as a way of escape from persecution by non-Christian Jews. But, since even Gentile Christians may have been exposed to the same persecution, some circumcised Gentiles may have joined their Jewish brethren in eagerness for the rite as a means of escape from Jewish hostility.

13. Proof of the foregoing unworthy motive. *They who receive circumcision:* Gentile converts made from time to time by the false teachers. *Not even* do these *themselves keep* prescriptions of *law:* although they are enrolling themselves among the people of the Old Covenant. Whether this refers to ritual or moral prescriptions, is not stated: and it does not affect the argument; for both elements had the same authority. It implies that some of these Gentile converts to Judaism lived in evident disregard of Jewish legal restrictions, or possibly of morality. And that their seducers tolerated this neglect proves that regard for the Law was not the motive of this zealous advocacy of circumcision. *But they wish:* including probably the seducers and referring chiefly to them. For, to them chiefly refers the same word *wish* in *v.* 12: they are the chief matter of *vv.* 12, 13, their converts being introduced only casually in proof of the motive of the seducers: and theirs chiefly must have been this desire and exultation, though shared by their Gentile converts. The change of subject between *v.* 13*a* and 13*b* is but an easy return to the chief matter of the paragraph. And it would be the more easy because the class referred to in *v.* 13*b* included some, or most, of those referred to in *v.* 13*a*; for Gentiles undergoing circumcision would themselves wish other Gentiles to follow their example, feeling that each fresh circumcision was a tribute to their recently adopted principles. Thus all the Christians in Galatia eager for circumcision, whether Jews or Gentiles, would form practically one body in opposition to the teaching of Paul.

The reading in the RV. text, *they who receive* (or *are receiving*)

circumcision, is preferred by all editors since Lachmann, and has rather better documentary evidence than that in the RV. margin, *who have been circumcised*. And this latter looks suspiciously like a correction by copyists who could not understand the other reading. The above exposition gives to the reading adopted its most natural meaning. Certainly it is easier to suppose a return, after the parenthesis of *v.* 13*a*, to Paul's chief matter than to expound *they who receive circumcision* as "the advocates of circumcision."

In order that, etc.: selfish purpose of the seducers. *Exult*: see under Rom. ii. 17, 1 Cor. i. 29. *Your flesh*: your circumcised bodies. These were the sought-for element of exultation. They wished to point in triumph to the visible mark of proselyting success, as a tribute to their personal influence and to the grandeur of Jewish privileges; and to use this mark as a shelter for themselves against Jewish persecution. The word *flesh*, instead of 'body,' reminds us that the matter of their triumph belonged to the outward and perishing and seductive side of human life. Cp. 2 Cor. xi. 18, 'boast according to flesh;' and Ph. iii. 3f, 'confidence in the flesh.' Thus, as in *v.* 12, this word keeps before us the teaching of §§ 21, 22.

14. *Me*: in emphatic contrast to 'those who boast in circumcision; literally, *to me let there be no exultation*. *In the cross*: a marked contrast to 'in your flesh.' Various matters, e.g. those quoted in 2 Cor. xi. 22, Ph. iii. 4ff, and Paul's matchless mental and moral power, might have aroused in him emotions of confidence and joy. But to him all these were nothing. Yet the heart which was indifferent to them was kindled into a glow of emotion by a symbol of his nation's degradation, (for the cross was a Roman punishment,) by *the cross* on which his beloved Master died a death of pain and shame.

The above wonderful statement, *v.* 14*b* explains. Paul cannot boast except in the cross of Christ because on that cross himself has been crucified. *Through which*, or *whom*: each rendering grammatically correct; and certain decision impossible. But since these words evidently explain Paul's exultation, of which not Christ but *the cross of Christ* is the specific and astounding element here, this is probably his precise reference. By means of the cross on which Christ died the *world* itself *has been crucified*. *Crucified*: as in ii. 20, v. 24. It gives vividness to the mode of Christ's death, and declares that in some real sense both the world and Paul have shared that death. The

world: the entire realm of men and things around. [The absence twice of the Greek article bids us look at the *world* qualitatively, i.e. in view of its magnitude, variety, and power: to Paul *a world has been crucified.*] The world was once to him a living and vast and tremendous reality. Upon its smile hung all his hopes: its frown was ruin. Consequently, he was the world's servant and slave: and the world was his absolute and imperious and cruel lord. This service was hopeless and degrading bondage. But now, through the death of Christ upon the cross, it has utterly and for ever passed away. The world can no longer terrify or beguile him. Thus Paul is free. Just so, around the corpse of Henry VIII., his courtiers felt themselves to be for the first time free; and breathed more freely because those lips and that brow and arm were henceforth silent and still and powerless. Also through death came Paul's freedom; through Christ's death upon the cross, which had brought about the death of Paul's tremendous tyrant. But the world was dead relatively, not absolutely. To thousands it was still, and is now, a master possessing irresistible power. Only to those joined to Christ Crucified is the world dead. Hence the word *to me*, thrust to the front for conspicuous emphasis. *And I to the world:* added to remind us that, although it is the *world* which through Christ's death has lost its vital power and may therefore be said to be *crucified*, yet the real change has taken place in Paul. By union with the Crucified his own past life of bondage and sin has come to an end. By his own, as well as by his Master's, death the captive has become free. Thus we have a triple crucifixion. Christ has set up His cross between Paul and the world: and they are separated completely and for ever. This triple crucifixion and its mysterious instrument evoke joy and a shout of liberty. And they forbid all other boasting: for all else belongs to *a world* which *has been crucified*. Thus the astounding statement of *v.* 14*a* is explained by the more astounding statement of *v.* 14*b*.

15. Verse 14 is practically a refusal to boast in any way about circumcision. This refusal Paul now supports by again saying that circumcision is neither gain nor loss. Since it can (v. 6) do nothing, it is (cp. 1 Cor. vii. 19) worth nothing. And therefore Paul cannot boast in it. *New creature*, or *new creation:* see under 2 Cor. v. 17; cp. Eph. ii. 10, iv. 24. So utterly lost is man that nothing less than a new putting forth of creative power can save him.

This verse implies that circumcision was not a condition of the putting forth by God of this creative power; as it was a condition (Gen. xvii. 10) of the covenant with Abraham. That it was a condition also of the New Covenant, the false teachers evidently asserted. And of this Better Covenant Baptism and the Lord's Supper, also outward rites, are conditions: for they were expressly ordained by Christ, and therefore refusal of them is disobedience to Him: cp. iii. 27, Rom. vi. 4; 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 25. But circumcision belonged to the earlier and now abrogated Covenant. To assert its perpetual obligation was to set up again the Mosaic Covenant which made the favour of God contingent on obedience to a multitude of moral and ritual prescriptions. No such obligation was involved in the requirement of Baptism. In the baptism of converts Paul might justly exult, as a triumph of the Gospel: and such exultation would be an exulting in God. So might others in earlier days exult in the circumcision of born heathens, as a turning to the God of Israel. That to Paul *circumcision is nothing*, proves how completely in his view the Old Covenant had passed away. Thus these words are a summing up, at the close of the Epistle, of its chief argument, which, by their similarity to v. 6 at the close of that argument, they recall.

16. *Walk:* same word in v. 25, Rom. iv. 12. Thus, just as *v.* 15 sums up the argument of DIV. II., so *v.* 16, which bids us make the principle asserted in *v.* 15 our rule of conduct, recalls the summary in v. 25 of the argument of DIV. III. *Rule:* literally, *canon:* see under 2 Cor. x. 13. It keeps up the metaphor suggested by the word *walk*. The principle in *v.* 15 was a marked-out line along which Paul's readers should direct their steps. *Shall walk:* throughout all future time. *Peace:* as in Rom. i. 7, where see notes; cp. Eph. vi. 23, 2 Th. iii. 16. It is a profound calm and rest, a consciousness of absolute security, derived from the presence and smile of God; the opposite of discord and of fear. *Upon them:* for this peace comes down from heaven. *Mercy*: Eph. ii. 4, 1 Tim. i. 2: that which prompts help to the helpless. That we need *mercy*, implies that we cannot save ourselves from wretchedness. Paul's thought rises from the *peace* which fills and keeps our hearts to the *mercy* of God from which it flows.

The Israel of God: that which God recognises as His chosen people: either the entire Church of God, or the Jewish part of it. The latter exposition would mark out (cp. *and* in Mk. i. 5, xvi. 7) the Jewish Christians as being specially objects of this good

wish: the former would imply that they who accept the principle announced in *v.* 15 occupy now the place of honour granted of old to the sacred nation. And this latter is probably Paul's meaning. For it is most unlikely that in this farewell blessing he would separate the Jewish Christians from, and raise them above, their Gentile brethren, when it has been the purpose of the whole Epistle to place Jews and Gentiles on the same level as equally children and heirs of Abraham: see iii. 7, 9, 14, 28, iv. 31; cp. Rom. iv. 11, 16f. Whereas, to speak of uncircumcised Gentile believers as *the Israel of God*, is a triumphant practical application, at the close of the Epistle, of its chief argument which has just been summed up in the assertion of *v.* 15. And it is a suitable conclusion of § 23 which is specially directed against Jewish opponents.

These words recall Ps. cxxv. 5, cxxviii. 6.

After proving by the arguments of this Epistle that the teaching of the disturbers is false, Paul now covers them with confusion by revealing the secret and unworthy motives of their apparent loyalty to the Law of Moses. Indeed, the proved falsity of the teaching prepares us to find that the teachers are insincere. Paul says that their professed loyalty is for the sake of appearances, a means of shielding themselves against persecution from the acknowledged enemies of the Crucified One. Such fear of men he disowned for himself utterly in ch. i. 10, before he began the argument of the Epistle, as though indicating beforehand the secret source of the teaching he was about to combat. And to this way of escape from persecution he referred again in v. 11 at the close of his chief argument. A proof that this is his opponents' real motive, Paul finds in the conduct of the Gentiles who from time to time receive circumcision. For, as matter of fact, they do not keep the Law. Consequently, desire that the Law be kept cannot be the motive of those who are so eager for the circumcision of Gentiles. Another motive for this eagerness is the tribute to the spiritual prerogatives of Israel, and to the personal influence of the proselyters, involved in the reception of the rite by fresh converts from heathenism. Probably, *vv.* 12, 13 would come to all parties concerned with an overwhelming force which we cannot now appreciate. For, doubtless, Paul's charge would be confirmed in various ways unknown to us. His outspoken accusation would explain conduct otherwise inexplicable. For unworthy motives, however carefully concealed, reveal themselves in a multitude of casual indications.

These hidden and base aims, thus brought to light, Paul puts utterly to shame by pointing to the Cross of Christ as his only ground of boasting; and to the total separation from the world, from its allurements and its terrors, which that Cross has wrought in him. And this exultation rests on the doctrines advocated throughout the Epistle. Upon all who hold them and make them their rule of life, Paul pronounces a rich blessing from God.

In §§ 21, 22 we learnt that the Holy Spirit given to believers is designed to save them from the rule of the flesh. The word 'flesh' twice in § 23 brings this teaching to bear upon the disturbers in Galatia. For, their unworthy motives belong altogether to the domain of bodily life. They exult in a merely outward rite deprived now of all inward and spiritual significance, because it offers them deliverance from the bodily affliction with which they are threatened by the enemies of Christ. Consequently, their eagerness for circumcision is but a sowing for the flesh.

SECTION XXIV.

FAREWELL.

CH. VI. 17, 18.

Henceforth let no one cause me trouble. For I bear the brand-marks of Jesus in my body. [18] *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ* be *with your spirit, Brethren, Amen.*

Henceforth: the past troubles being more than sufficient. *Let no one trouble me:* literally, *labours let no one afford me,* viz. such toil and weariness as that imposed on Paul by his opponents. *The marks:* a technical term for tatoo or brand marks, which were frequent with slaves, criminals, soldiers, and even votaries of some particular deity. E.g. Herodotus (bk. vii. 233) says of the Thebans who at Thermopylæ turned to the Persians; "the more part of them, by Xerxes' command, they marked with royal marks." So 3 Macc. ii. 29, "marked in the body by fire with the ivy-leaf sign of Dionysus." Such marks were forbidden to Israel: Lev. xix. 28. Since these *marks* were evidently a badge of honour, and since there is no reference here to military life, whereas Paul ever rejoices to call himself a servant or slave of Christ and speaks of Him in *vv.* 14 and 18 as his Lord, it is easiest to understand the word here in this last

sense. *In my body;* suggests that he refers to the scars received in the many scourgings, imprisonments, and other hardships, (2 Cor. xi. 24,) endured in the service of Christ. These scars proclaimed, in contrast to the disturbers whose chief thought was to escape persecution, how faithful that service had been. Therefore, as insignia of his Master, Paul bore them in triumph. And, because of the sufferings of which these marks were witnesses, he claimed immunity from the weariness caused him by the contention of the Judaizers.

The advocates of circumcision point with pride to the circumcised bodies of their converts. Paul points to his own body which bears marks of hardships endured for Christ, these hardships testifying the faithfulness of his service. This was no mere exultation in the flesh: for these scars in the flesh had deep spiritual significance, inasmuch as they reveal the work in Paul's spirit of the Spirit of God. They place Paul and his career in significant contrast to his opponents. Than this silent comparison, no appeal could be more forceful.

18. *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ:* as in (1 Cor. xvi. 23) 2 Cor. xiii. 13. *Your spirit:* as in Rom. i. 9, viii. 10, 16, 1 Cor. ii. 11, v. 3—5, xiv. 14—16, 32, xvi. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 13. It is perhaps suggested here by the contrast of 'my body:' although in 2 Tim. iv. 22, Philem. 25 we have similar words without any such contrast. Paul desires that in the noblest element of his readers' nature, in that part of them which is nearest to God and most like God and on which the Spirit of God directly operates, the smile of Christ may shine upon them. Parting with them, after a letter of severe condemnation, he calls them *brothers*. And with a concluding *Amen* he confirms his parting benediction.

THE DISTURBERS IN GALATIA. The letter before us is evidently an attempt to recall the Galatian Christians from an apostacy already making progress among them and threatening to destroy utterly the Churches of Galatia. Such a letter can be understood only so far as we understand the errors it was designed to correct. We will therefore gather together, before reviewing the Epistle, all indications, which are found chiefly in the Epistle itself, of these errors; and endeavour thus to gain a view of the teaching which Paul here combats.

Beside the errors prevalent in Galatia, we meet in this Epistle with three types of Jewish error, viz. in certain 'false brethren'

at Jerusalem, ii. 4; in some men who came from Jerusalem to Antioch, *v.* 12; and in the Jews resident at Antioch, *v.* 13. (1) That the false brethren at Jerusalem are said to have crept secretly into the Church in order to understand the Gospel that thus they might overthrow it, proves that their Christian profession was only a mask, that they were simply traitors in the camp. They were Jews who rejected Christianity and used against it weapons of deceit. Similar men, apparently connected with the Church at Corinth, are described and denounced in 2 Cor. xi. 13ff. (2) That the Jews whose arrival at Antioch (cp. Acts xv. 1) wrought so marked and evil a change there were guilty of like deception, Paul gives no hint. They may have been men who, after Jewish birth and training, finding the Law insufficient to save them, had accepted Jesus as the promised Messiah, had bowed to Him as their Lord and still clung to Him as their Saviour; but who nevertheless felt themselves bound by their ancient Law and believed that without obedience to its prescriptions they could not enjoy the favour of God or obtain the Eternal Life promised by Christ. Possibly, sincerity of belief and purity of life gave weight to their influence. Of the terrible logical consequence of such belief, their Jewish training and surroundings and their sincerity would easily make them unconscious. They looked up to James as their leader: for his teaching was in less marked opposition to their views than was that of Paul. Similar men we find on a visit to Antioch in Acts xv. 1; and others at Jerusalem in *v.* 5, these latter being called believers. But their faith was evidently immature. (3) From these we must distinguish the Jews already at Antioch, who yielded, under Peter's example, to the influence of the new comers. These last, Paul calls 'hypocrites.' For, living as they did among uncircumcised Gentile Christians, they knew in their hearts that the distinction of meats had passed away; and yet acted as though it were still binding. They did so apparently without any definite aim, influenced merely by the Jewish Christians lately come from Jerusalem who represented, and by their presence brought to bear at Antioch, the weight of the entire Jewish nation.

The foregoing varieties of error had in common the assertion that circumcision and the prescriptions of the Law were still binding on all Christians.

Paul's condemnatory description of these Jewish Christians at Jerusalem and Antioch was evidently designed to be a mirror in

which the Christians of Galatia should see reflected the Jewish teachers who were leading them astray. By these teachers they were treated with (iv. 17) the greatest attention, were led to observe (*v.* 10) Jewish festivals, and were strenuously urged (vi. 12) to receive circumcision. But in all this the false teachers were simply endeavouring to shield themselves from persecution. That they were in danger of it, proves that they were, in some imperfect and vain sense, believers in Christ. For against mere hypocrites, like those mentioned in ii. 4, no persecution would be directed. Or, certainly, they might at once have escaped it by proclaiming themselves enemies of Christ. Their danger suggests that in their heart of hearts they believed that Jesus is the Messiah and were boping for the blessings He promised to bestow. Their religion seems to have been a compromise between desire for the favour of Christ and a wish to propitiate His enemies. The former they sought by professing themselves Christians: the latter by eager advocacy (vi. 12) of Jewish prerogatives. And Paul declares (v. 11) that he might escape persecution in the same way.

That even in heathen countries the hostility of Jews was an element of danger to Christians, is proved by the ill-treatment Paul received, at the instigation of Jews, at Antioch in Pisidia, at Iconium, and at Lystra, cities on the borders of Galatia. And the motive mentioned in vi. 12 suggests that this hostility arose from jealousy for the peculiar spiritual prerogatives claimed by the Jews on the ground of the Old Covenant and strenuously asserted, of which prerogatives circumcision was a conspicuous badge. These prerogatives, the Gospel as preached by Paul utterly trampled under foot.

This motive also suggests that, like the Jewish Christians residing at Antioch, the disturbers in Galatia did not themselves believe their own teaching that circumcision was needful for salvation. Or possibly the convenience of the compromise gradually perverted their judgment. If so their religious belief, and in any case their action, were controlled by care for their bodily life, i.e. by the flesh. That their zeal for circumcision was not prompted by genuine loyalty to the Law, Paul proves by their converts' practical disregard of its requirements, which they evidently tolerated.

Paul's assertion and careful proof of his apostolic authority and of his independence of the earlier apostles can be explained only by supposing that these were denied by the disturbers in Galatia

And this we can easily understand. For the Gospel he preached repudiated utterly the compromise by which they hoped to escape persecution: and his teaching and influence could be withstood only by saying that he had himself perverted the Gospel of Christ. The distance of the other apostles made possible an insinuation that his authority as a Christian teacher was derived from them, and that he had been unfaithful to the charge thus received. The men before us were thus compelled, by the false position they had taken up, to place themselves in opposition to the greatest of the Apostles.

Paul declares in i. 7, v. 10, 12 that his opponents were unsettling the Christians in Galatia, and were wishing to overturn the Gospel. They even threaten to destroy (iv. 10) the Churches he had planted. For, by asserting the perpetual validity of the Law they proclaimed implicitly a universal curse which shuts out all men from the blessings promised by Christ and renders the death of Christ meaningless and useless. Against such teaching and teachers Paul pronounces a tremendous and repeated Anathema; and almost hopes that they will join the ranks of heathendom. This proves that their conduct was inexcusable and sinful, that their faith in Christ did not influence their inner life, and that their profession of Christianity was an empty name. That Paul, while writing about them, never speaks to them, but only to their victims, proves that in his view their case was utterly hopeless.

All this we can best harmonise by supposing that the disturbers in Galatia had honestly accepted Jesus of Nazareth as the foretold Messiah, had believed His promise of eternal life, and had enrolled themselves among His professed followers. But the words and Spirit of Jesus had not permeated and renovated their heart and thought and life; or had ceased to do so. Consequently, as the first impulse which led them into the Church waned, they yielded to fear of the hostility of their fellow-countrymen. And the Gospel, which would have given them victory over all adverse surroundings had they accepted it without reserve, itself fell, in their conception of it, under the control of the needs of their bodily life and sank into an empty profession powerless to save. Yet the first influence did not altogether leave them. While pursuing eagerly a course subversive of the Church of Christ, they nevertheless called themselves His servants and hoped for a place in His eternal Kingdom. How vain were their hopes, the whole tenor of the Epistle affords tremendous proof. They are to us an abiding monument of the peril of permitting our belief and

practice to be moulded by the needs or convenience of our present bodily life; of all compromises between the Spirit and the flesh, between truth and error.

REVIEW OF THE EPISTLE. To a Church in which it had been questioned, Paul begins his letter by asserting his independent apostolic authority; and in the greeting of an Epistle devoted chiefly to the doctrine of justification by faith he weaves the correlative historical fact of Christ's resurrection and the doctrine that He gave Himself for the sins of men. The gratitude with which in other Epistles he turns to his readers gives place here to wonder that they are so soon turning away from God, and to a repeated curse on any who lead them astray. And, in view of the secret motive of the false guides, he declares that to make the favour of men our aim is to renounce the service of Christ.

Paul then proves from known facts that the Gospel he preaches is independent of human authority. His previous life attests the divine source of the revelation which has wrought in him so great a change. For three years after his conversion he did not so much as see the other apostles; and then saw only Peter and James, and for a short time. And when, many years later, he went up to Jerusalem and expounded to the apostles his teaching among the Gentiles, they desired no change in it, but recognised at once his independent mission. Indeed, some time afterwards, at Antioch, he publicly reproved Peter for action similar to that of the disturbers in Galatia; and supported his reproof by an appeal to the past inward experience of Peter and of himself and to his own present life in Christ.

Having thus proved by known facts that his teaching is independent of human authority, Paul now comes to defend the teaching itself. That salvation is by faith, he proves from his readers' own experience, which he shows to be in harmony with the story of Abraham. The Law cannot save: for it pronounces a universal curse, from which Christ saved us by Himself bearing it. Had God made obedience to law a condition of the fulfilment of His promise to Abraham, He would have invalidated the promise by a subsequent addition to it; which even human morality forbids. Yet the Law must have a worthy purpose. It was designed to force us to Christ for salvation by faith. And this purpose has in us been accomplished. The Law belongs to spiritual childhood, which is a state of bondage. But now the set time has come, and we are free: for in our hearts the Spirit

proclaims that we are sons of God. Yet, by seeking salvation in sacred seasons, the Galatian Christians are turning back to the bondage of childhood.

This complete argument is followed by a direct appeal recalling the joyous founding of the Galatian Churches and revealing the unworthy motive of the earnestness of the disturbers. This again is followed by an historical application of the main argument. Since the Law brings bondage, they who look to it for salvation are in the position of the children of Hagar. And the expulsion of Hagar and her son from the family of Abraham proclaims the exclusion of these their modern representatives from the blessings promised to Abraham's seed.

The entire foregoing argument, Paul then brings to bear on the matter of circumcision by asserting that to receive the rite is to accept obligation to keep the whole Law. With such obligation he contrasts his own religious life; and concludes the matter of circumcision by sundry appeals.

The doctrine of justification by faith apart from works renders absolutely needful an exposition of Christian morals: and this exposition Paul throws into a form specially suitable to the case of his readers. To advocates of the abiding validity of the Mosaic Law, who yet needed to be warned against mutual conflict, he points out the sum of that Law, viz. love to our neighbour: and, in the presence of men whose teaching was moulded by care for the flesh, he proclaims the ceaseless antagonism of the flesh and the Spirit. These two great principles of Christian morality he applies to sundry details.

A mark of his earnestness Paul gives by recurring, at the end of the Epistle, in his own hand-writing, to its chief matter; and reveals the real and specific motive of these eager advocates of circumcision. This evokes an exultant boast in that cross of Christ which his opponents practically trampled under foot.

DISSERTATION I.

THE BOOK OF ACTS COMPARED WITH THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

1. That the Book of Acts was written by Luke, a companion of Paul, and that it contains a trustworthy narrative, we have already (*Corinthians*, Diss. ii.) found strong reason to believe. With the consecutive narrative there given, we will now compare the many personal notices in the Epistle to the Galatians.

2. The record in Acts viii. 3, ix. 1f is confirmed in Gal. i. 13f by the testimony of the persecutor himself; who also says that the motive of his earnestness was zeal for the traditions of his ancestors. The introductory word *ye-have-heard* is in remarkable agreement with Acts xxii. 4 and xxvi. 10, where we twice find Paul telling the story of his early life. The word *paternal* in Gal. i. 14 recalls a similar word from the lips of Paul in Acts xxii. 3, xxiv. 14, xxviii. 17. *The paternal traditions* are explained by his own declaration in Acts xxiii. 6, 'I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees.' *It pleased God to reveal His Son in me* (Gal. i. 15f) is an exact inner counterpart of the event narrated in Acts ix. 3—7: and in xxvi. 16—18 (cp. xxii. 15) we have from the lips of the Risen Saviour the purpose stated in Gal. i. 16, *that as good news I should announce him among the Gentiles.*

The conciseness of the narrative forbids us to say that Acts xxii. 17, although suggesting an earlier return to Jerusalem, actually contradicts Gal. i. 18, *after three years.* Whereas, that Paul *went up* from Damascus *to Jerusalem*, agrees with Acts ix. 26. His motive, as stated in Gal. i. 18, does not contradict Acts ix. 23ff. For, when compelled to leave Damascus, a desire to see Peter might suggest a journey to Jerusalem. That Paul remained there fifteen days, agrees well with the indefinite statements in Acts ix. 30, xxii. 18.

On the other hand, that after three years Paul was (Acts ix. 26) an object of suspicion to the apostles at Jerusalem and that they

needed to be told by Barnabas 'how in the way he had seen the Lord,' is a difficulty which I can neither deny nor solve. For the distance (140 miles) was not such as would delay for three years tidings that the man commissioned to bring Christians captive to Jerusalem had himself become a servant of Christ. Indeed the narrative of Acts xi. 22 suggests that in much less time other good news reached Jerusalem from Antioch, a city more than twice as far away as Damascus. And the news from Antioch was not more likely to travel than was news of the the conversion of the persecutor who was devastating the Church. But, be this as it may, the proved and unquestioned genuineness of the Epistle, and the importance of the argument involved in this three years' delay, compel us to accept Paul's statement that his next visit to Jerusalem was not till three years after his conversion. And, on the other hand, testing it merely by the principles of ordinary historical criticism, (and we have no other means of dealing with apparent contradiction in the narratives of Holy Scripture,) it is in the last degree unlikely that the beautiful story of Acts ix. 26f is without foundation in fact. The key to the difficulty is lost in the scantiness of our materials. Perhaps among the many enemies of the early Church Saul was not actually so conspicuous as his subsequent career makes him in the pages of the Book of Acts. And possibly his seclusion in Arabia may have hid him from view of the Christians at Jerusalem. Or, is it possible that his pronounced rejection of the Mosaic Law as no longer binding had made the young convert less welcome to some of the Christian Jews of Damascus, and that they had reported of him somewhat unfavourably to companions of like mind at Jerusalem, where even among Christians (cp. Acts xxi. 20) the Law was held in excessive reverence; and that such reports caused suspicion there? In any case, this contradiction in a small detail cannot neutralise the many points of agreement. For such agreement can be accounted for only by supposing that the events recorded actually took place; whereas mistakes in detail are easily accounted for by the imperfection of human observation and research. We notice also that the contradiction refers to events of which apparently Luke was not an eye-witness.

That in Acts ix. 27 Paul is said to have been brought 'to the Apostles,' whereas he says in Gal. i. 19 that he saw only Peter and James, presents, in the indefiniteness of a popular narrative, no difficulty. By introducing him to Peter and perhaps to James,

Barnabas introduced Paul to the apostolic band. That he did not see the others, as from his own solemn attestation we cannot doubt, must have had a cause; probably their absence from Jerusalem, engaged probably in work similar to that which (Acts ix. 32) led Peter soon afterwards to Lydda, Joppa, and Cæsarea.

The mention of Cilicia in Gal. i. 21 agrees closely with the statement in Acts ix. 30 that Paul went from Jerusalem to Tarsus, the capital of Cilicia: similarly, the mention of Syria accords with the labours at Antioch recorded in ch. xi. 26. The order *Syria and Cilicia* presents no difficulty, and does not even suggest that Paul went to Tarsus by way of Antioch. For, during this long period he resided in both cities successively, and probably preached Christ in the surrounding districts: and therefore the countries are given in their geographical position viewed from Jerusalem.

That Paul remained (Gal. i. 22) *unknown to the Churches of Judæa*, seems to contradict the statement in Acts ix. 29 that he spoke boldly to the Hellenist Jews at Jerusalem. And the difficulty is not removed by supposing that *the Churches of Judæa* did not include that of Jerusalem. See my note. Moreover, it is difficult to find room in Paul's biography for his own statement recorded in Acts xxvi. 20 that after preaching first at Damascus he preached at Jerusalem and in 'all the country of Judæa.' But the scantiness of our materials forbids us to infer that this last statement is necessarily incorrect. And, on the visit to Jerusalem recorded in Acts ix. 26, possibly Paul's earnestness to save others might bring him in contact almost exclusively with non-Christians, except that he was a close companion of Peter and James. These suggestions do not remove, but they somewhat lessen, the apparent contradictions. And the many coincidences are a clear proof of the general trustworthiness of the Book of Acts and of the genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians.

3. The second visit to Jerusalem mentioned in this letter (ch. ii. 1) agrees with the visit recorded in Acts xi. 30 inasmuch as in each case Barnabas is said to have been Paul's companion. But we learn from Josephus (*Antiq.* xix. 8. 2, cp. *Wars* ii. 11. 6) that Agrippa, (called Herod in Acts xii. 1,) who about this time and at Easter (*v.* 3) put Peter in prison, died in the fourth year of Claudius, i.e. A.D. 44. This double statement in the consecutive and full narratives of the Jewish historian outweighs far the casual remark of the Roman historian Tacitus, in his *Annals*

(bk. xii. 23) of A.D. 49, that Agrippa had recently died. Tacitus probably mistook for Agrippa his brother Herod king of Chalcis, who actually died at that time and was succeeded by the younger Agrippa, son of the king mentioned in Acts xii. 1. Josephus also says (*Antiq.* xx. 5. 2,) that in the days of Cuspius Fadus, governor of Judæa after the death of Agrippa, "the great famine" happened there; doubtless the famine foretold (Acts xi. 28) by Agabus. These notes of time fix approximately, almost to certainty, the date of the visit recorded in Acts xi. 30. And they prove that it cannot have been the visit mentioned in Gal. ii. 1. For even though we measure the *fourteen years* from Paul's conversion, which is not the simplest exposition, our reckoning backwards from Easter A.D. 44 would carry back his conversion to an impossibly early date. On the other hand there are no collateral marks of identity of these visits to Jerusalem. Of each visit a definite purpose is stated: but the purposes are quite different. We have in Acts ix. 30—xii. 25 no hint of serious conflict within the Church, as described in Gal. ii. 4. And the terrible persecution then raging makes such conflict very improbable. It is also more likely that the demand in Acts xv. 1 that the Gentiles be circumcised was made before, rather than after, a similar demand in the case of Titus had been (Gal. ii. 5) refused by the apostles at Jerusalem. Moreover, the pre-eminence of Paul among Gentile Christians assumed in Gal. ii. 1—9 accords much better with his position in Acts xv. 2, where his name is put before that of Barnabas, than in ch. xi. 30 a year or two after Barnabas had brought him from Tarsus to Antioch.

The above difficulties compel us to seek for the visit referred to in Gal. ii. 1 in Paul's third visit as a Christian to Jerusalem, recorded in Acts xv. 2ff. Again Barnabas is his companion. The occasion of the journey was a discussion at Antioch aroused by a demand that the Gentile converts be circumcised. And the travellers' arrival at Jerusalem and their account of God's work among the Gentiles evoked a similar demand there. But it was refused in a gathering of the Church, on the recommendation of Peter and James: and a letter disowning those who had taught the need of circumcision for Gentiles was drawn up at the bidding of the assembly and sent to Antioch. These many and essential coincidences assure us that Gal. ii. 1ff and Acts xv. 2ff refer to the same visit. If so, Titus, himself a noble specimen of the Gentile converts, was one of the 'certain others' sent with Paul by the Church at Antioch. And if the choice were by Paul's

suggestion, this would easily account for his words in Gal. ii. 1, *taking with me also Titus*. That Paul was moved to go by (*v.* 2) a divine *revelation*, made him not the less (Acts xv. 2) a delegate of the Church at Antioch. Possibly a divine intimation to him suggested to the Church the mission to Jerusalem; or gave divine approval to a proposal already made. (Similarly, in Acts ix. 30 and xxii. 17 we have an outward occasion and divine guidance.) Paul's eagerness (Acts xv. 2) in the dispute at Antioch is explained by his consciousness, expressed in Gal. ii. 2, that the success of the Gospel hung upon the matter in dispute. We can also well believe that his caution prompted him to secure in (Gal. ii. 2) a private interview, before the public meeting described in Acts xv. 6ff, the support of the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem. In that interview they assured him (*v.* 9) of their concurrence: and in the assembly which followed (Acts xv. 7ff) they publicly expressed it. But of this assembly it was needless for Paul to speak in his Epistle. For he is here proving his agreement with the other apostles, which was fully attested by their action at the private interview.

The only serious objection to this identification is that Gal. ii. 1 suggests that Paul did not go up to Jerusalem until *fourteen years after* the above-mentioned visit. But this difficulty is not so great as the chronological difficulty, or impossibility, of supposing that Paul refers here to the visit recorded in Acts xi. 30. Nor does it neutralise the many and close coincidences just noted. It would rather cast doubt on the historic correctness of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. But the shortness of the record, and the persecution then raging, suggest that this visit was very short, affording perhaps little opportunity for intercourse with the apostles. And, if so, Paul may have passed over it in Gal. ii. 1 as not bearing upon the matter in hand. For, his argument here rests, not on his absence from Jerusalem as it did in ch. i. 17ff, but on the cordial agreement of the earlier apostles when after many years he met them there. The lapse of time is mentioned chiefly for chronological exactness. Certainly this suggestion is sufficient to warn us not lightly to cast doubt on the proved general accuracy of the Book of Acts.

It has been suggested (see an Excursus in Wieseler's commentary) that the visit referred to in Gal. ii. 1 is that suggested or implied in Acts xviii. 22; (the mention of Jerusalem in our AV. is almost certainly spurious;) chiefly on the ground that in this Epistle Paul does not refer to the decree issued by the Confer-

ence although this decree was conclusive proof that the earlier apostles agreed with Paul and was given by Paul (Acts xvi. 4) to Churches on the border of Galatia and therefore probably also to the Churches of Galatia, and on the ground that the decree from Jerusalem differs somewhat (see below) from the teaching of Paul. But this suggestion involves insuperable difficulties. It is inconceivable that Paul would pass in silence over an event so important, and bearing so directly on the question at issue as the conference described in Acts xv. 6ff. Nor can we conceive him laying before his colleages at Jerusalem, in the serious manner described in Gal. ii. 2, the Gospel he preached after they had, three years before, publicly and formally expressed their agreement with it. Nor, on the other hand, is his silence about the decree in any way explained by supposing it to have been written three years before the visit here referred to, instead of immediately after it. In either case the decree bore directly on the matter under discussion: for it tacitly admitted that Gentile Christians need not be circumcised. Possibly, Paul refrained from mentioning it because, as we learn from 1 Cor. viii. 8, Rom. xiv. 2ff, he could not support it as absolutely binding in all points, e.g. in its prohibition of meat sacrificed to idols. And whatever the decree contains touching the matter in hand was practically embodied in a fact which he states and which none could deny, viz. that Titus, Paul's well-known companion, known probably in Galatia, had been received and recognised by the Church in Jerusalem, although uncircumcised, and in face of a protest from some members of the Church. This fact was decisive, apart from the decree. It is also quite possible that the apostles agreed entirely with Paul's view even of idol-sacrifices and that the prohibition to eat them was a compromise for the sake of peace: cp. Acts xxi. 20ff. Certainly they agreed with him heartily in the matter under discussion in this Epistle, viz. the circumcision of Gentile converts.

So conclusive is the evidence, that the identification here advocated is now almost universally accepted. And it seems to have been the earliest identification. We find it in Irenæus, *Heresies* bk. iii. 13. 3. Moreover, the many coincidences which support this identification, amid differences which disprove copying of either account from the other, are no small proof of the genuineness of the Epistle and of the historical correctness of the Book of Acts.

4. The mention in Gal. ii. 11 of Peter's visit to *Antioch*, the

only reference in Paul's Epistles to the capital of Syria, is a very interesting coincidence with the position given to Antioch in Acts xi. 20, 26, xiv. 26 as the mother-city of Gentile Christendom, and with the notice in ch. xv. 35 that Paul and Barnabas spent some time there after their return from the conference at Jerusalem. And Peter's unfaithfulness at Antioch under the influence of Jews lately come from Jerusalem, after his brave support of Paul in the conference there, is in exact accord with the instability depicted so vividly in the Gospels. Cp. Jno. xviii. 10 with *vv.* 17, 25ff, and Mt. xiv. 29 with *v.* 30.

The mention in Gal. iv. 13 of a *former* visit of Paul to Galatia, implying a later visit, is a casual but remarkable agreement with the two visits mentioned in Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23.

5. Of the Judaizing element in the Christian Church which evoked the Epistle to the Galatians, we have abundant evidence in the Book of Acts. We find it in the resistance to Peter at Jerusalem after the baptism of Cornelius, and in the contention with Paul both at Antioch and at Jerusalem after his first missionary journey. And in Acts xxi. 20ff witness is borne by James, the leader of the Church at Jerusalem, to the widespread suspicion and misrepresentation, among the Jewish Christians there, of Paul and his teaching. It was a counterpart within the Church of the uniform and intense hostility of the Jews to Paul wherever he went: cp. Acts xiii. 45, 50, xiv. 5, 19, xvii. 5, xviii. 12. Paul's resistance to this Judaizing tendency is naturally less conspicuous in the simple narrative of the Book of Acts than in a letter written purposely to counteract it in a place in which it had become a deadly peril. But in Acts xv. 2 the earnestness of Paul's resistance is in a few words vividly depicted. And it is implied in the later misrepresentation at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 21) of his teaching among the Gentiles.

Paul's determined opposition to the circumcision of Titus seems at first sight inconsistent with Acts xvi. 3 where he is said to have circumcised Timothy 'because of the Jews.' But that which was right to do of his own accord in order to gain for Timothy access to Jews, i.e. to open and perhaps honest rejecters of Christ, might be wrong as a concession to a demand from false brethren teaching within the Church serious error. Moreover, whereas Titus was a Greek, Timothy had been reared by a Jewish mother. Consequently, his circumcision was not, as would have been that of Titus, an acknowledgment that the rite was universally binding. It was rather an exemplification of

Paul's own principle stated in 1 Cor. ix. 20, 'I became to the Jews as a Jew that I might gain Jews.' For these would listen to a circumcised preacher of the Gospel much more readily than to one whom they looked upon as an apostate from Moses. Consequently, the statement in Acts xvi. 3 is no proof of the writer's inaccuracy.

6. A very important doctrinal coincidence with the Epistle to the Galatians is Acts xiii. 38, 39, where we read that 'in Christ every one who believes is justified' and thus obtains 'forgiveness of sins' in a way impossible 'by the Law of Moses.' These two verses are a concentrated embodiment of the teaching of the Epistle to the Galatians. This coincidence is the more remarkable because no writer in the New Testament except Paul speaks of justification by faith, and nowhere else except Lk. xviii. 14 do we read of justification as a present enjoyment.

7. The notes of time collected above, we will now endeavour to connect, reckoning backwards, with the dates determined in Diss. iii. of my *Corinthians*. We there found reason to believe that Paul was at Ephesus (cp. Acts xx. 31) from A.D. 55 to the spring of A.D. 58. It is therefore probable that in the spring of A.D. 55, the most likely time of year for beginning a journey, he started from Antioch (Acts xviii. 23) on his third missionary tour. The 'some time' spent at Antioch would doubtless include the winter of A.D. 54. And the journey described in Acts xviii. 18—22 may well have been accomplished during the summer; allowing us to suppose that Paul sailed from Corinth for Syria in the spring of the same year. If so, his sojourn at Corinth of more than eighteen months (*v.* 11) would include two winters and the intervening summer: i.e. he arrived there in the autumn of A.D. 52. And, since on that journey, his second missionary tour, he was detained in Galatia by illness and founded Churches there, we must suppose that he started from Antioch in the early spring. But before starting on this journey Paul spent some time (Acts xv. 35f) at Antioch; during which time Peter came, and others from Jerusalem. This brings the date of the conference at Jerusalem to the previous year, A.D. 51. Reckoning back fourteen years, Paul's first visit to Jerusalem must have been in A.D. 37 or 38, and his conversion about A.D. 35.

The simplicity of this reckoning, and its agreement with all the known facts of the case, confirm somewhat the identification advocated above. The intervals stated in Gal. i. 18, ii. 1 are almost our only reliable indications of the time of Paul's con-

version and of his first subsequent visit to Jerusalem. And the many coincidences here noted, of which the full force can be felt only by personal study, produce an irresistible conviction that we have before us a genuine letter of the great apostle, and in the Book of Acts a narrative, correct in the main, of his life and work. And this conviction is strengthened by the total absence in the Book of Acts of any mention of Paul's sickness and labours in Galatia, and of the circumstances which occasioned this letter. But, unfortunately, our comparison of the two documents has not furnished us with any indication of the exact date of the Epistle. Some such indications, however, we shall find in our comparison of the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians.

DISSERTATION II.

THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS AND TO THE ROMANS COMPARED WITH THAT TO THE GALATIANS.

1. In my *Romans* Introd. iv. 3 we found proof that the Epistle to the Romans was written later than those to the Corinthians. With these three Epistles, in the order of time, we will now compare the Epistle to the Galatians.

2. The absence of any references to matters of fact binding the Epistles together compels us to look for points of doctrinal contact.

As in Gal. iv. 19 so in 1 Cor. iv. 15, 2 Cor. vi. 13, xii. 14 Paul remembers that his readers, though unfaithful, are his own spiritual children. Amid the various matters dealt with in order in 1 Corinthians, the one matter which engrosses attention in the Epistle to the Galatians finds casual but full expression in 1 Cor. vii. 19, 'circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but a keeping of the commandments of God;' almost the words which in Gal. vi. 15 sum up the teaching of the Epistle. The phrase *under law* in Gal. iii. 23, iv. 4, 5, 21, v. 18 reappears in 1 Cor. ix. 20, and in Rom. vi. 14, 15. And the term *tutor* or *pædagogue*, by which in Gal. iii. 24 Paul describes the Law, is used by him, also as a metaphor, in 1 Cor. iv. 15. In 1 Cor. ix. 27, where Paul finds an antagonist in his own body, we have a very important, though casual, coincidence with the

hostile influence attributed to the flesh in Gal. v. 17. The death of Christ occupies in all four Epistles the same unique place. And the word *bought* (with a price), conspicuously repeated in 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, is found in a strengthened form in Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5. That Christ *gave Himself for our sins*, in Gal. i. 4, has a counterpart in 1 Cor. xv. 3, 'died for our sins:' cp. Rom. iv. 25. *The grace given to me* in Gal. ii. 9 recalls 1 Cor. iii. 10, (i. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 1,) Rom. xii. 3, 6, xv. 15. The divine *call* in 1 Cor. i. 9, 24, 26, so conspicuous in vii. 15—24 and in Rom. viii. 28, 30, ix. 11, 24, xi. 29, reappears in Gal. i. 6, 15, v. 8, 13. The phrase *ye are Christ's* unites Gal. iii. 29 to 1 Cor. iii. 23, 2 Cor. x. 7: and the remarkable words *known by God* are common to 1 Cor. viii. 3 and Gal. iv. 9. Similar lists of sins occur in 1 Cor. vi. 9, v. 11, 2 Cor. xii. 20, Rom. i. 29, Gal. v. 19. In two of these (also 1 Cor. xv. 50) we have the conspicuous phrase *shall not inherit the kingdom of God*: cp. Gal. iv. 30. The words *be not deceived* in Gal. vi. 7 are also in 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 33. The sowing and reaping of Gal. vi. 7—9 recall a metaphor in 1 Cor. ix. 11, 2 Cor. ix. 6. The repeated *Anathema* in Gal. i. 8, 9 recalls the same word in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, xii. 3. The motto *a little leaven leavens the whole lump* in Gal. v. 9 occurs word for word in 1 Cor. v. 6.

3. With 2 Corinthians, owing to a closer similarity of circumstances, the Epistle to the Galatians presents points of still closer contact. Of these two Epistles, the whole of the latter and part of the former were written, in anxiety relieved by rays of hope, (2 Cor. xii. 20, xi. 3, x. 6, vii. 16: Gal. iv. 11, 20, v. 10,) to guard beloved children in Christ (2 Cor. xii. 14, Gal. iv. 19) against the false teaching of Jewish Christians who had gained influence among them. These advocates of Judaism, Paul speaks of in each case in the third person, thus pointedly separating them from his readers: cp. 2 Cor. x. 2, 12, xi. 5, 12f, 22 with Gal. i. 7, iv. 17, v. 10, 12, vi. 12f. The false teachers in Galatia (Gal. i. 7, v. 10, 12) desired to overturn the Gospel and were upsetting the members of the Church: and certainly no less could be said of those at Corinth who are called in 2 Cor. xi. 15 'ministers of Satan.' Indeed, the 'other Jesus' and 'other kind of Gospel' in 2 Cor. xi. 4 are supplemented and explained by Gal. i. 6f. Each set of seducers was influenced by concealed and selfish motives: 2 Cor. xi. 12f, Gal. iv. 17, vi. 13. And upon each will punishment fall: 2 Cor. xi. 15, Gal. v. 10. But Paul's words allow us to hope that the Judaizers in Galatia were

less openly hostile to himself and less wicked than those at Corinth. In contrast to these deceivers, to whom he says nothing and for whom he seems to have had no hope, Paul addresses to his readers in each case earnest and direct appeal. (Gal. iv. 12 is in its spirit a close parallel to 2 Cor. vi. 11—vii. 4, xi. 1f.) And for these he cherishes a measure of hope. But the degree of hope differs greatly in the two Epistles. The severity threatened at Corinth is only for a part of the Church which has fallen into immorality: of the Church as a whole he speaks (2 Cor. vii. 16) with strong confidence. Against the Galatians he brings no direct charge of immorality. But the entire Church was wandering away from the faith which unites men to Christ. And the gloom which covers Paul's letter is relieved by only one or two rays of hope: chs. v. 10, vi. 16. It is worthy of note that against some at Corinth (x. 2, xiii. 2, 10) Paul threatens severity, waiting only till the mass of the Church be fully restored: against the Galatian Christians we have no threatening, but fear (iv. 10) lest Paul's work among them be in vain. These various points of similarity and difference, both in his opponents and in his treatment of them, are proofs that on the pages of these Epistles is reflected actual church-life.

A very close parallel to 2 Cor. v. 21 is Gal. iii. 13: and *a new creature* is found only in Gal. vi. 15 and 2 Cor. v. 17.

4. Coming now to the Epistle to the Romans we notice, along with coincidences common to the Epistles to the Corinthians, numerous other coincidences of an altogether different kind. All the more conspicuous thoughts in the Epistle to the Galatians find counterparts in that to the Romans. The same doctrines are again and again stated in the same words, and defended by similar arguments. And doctrines and arguments concise almost to obscurity in the one Epistle are explained and supplemented in the other. This similarity has no parallel in the letters attributed to Paul except, though in less degree, in the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians. It has also a parallel in the Gospel and First Epistle of John.

5. The First of the Five Fundamental Doctrines of the Epistle to the Romans, viz. that God accepts as righteous all who believe the Gospel, (see under Rom. iii. 22,) is the chief matter of the Epistle to the Galatians. And in each Epistle the doctrine is stated in the same words, *justified by faith*. Cp. Gal. ii. 16, iii. 8, 24 with Rom. iii. 24, 26, 28, 30, v. 1. This is the more remarkable because elsewhere in the New Testament this phrase

is found only in Acts xiii. 39 where we have recorded words of Paul; and justification as present and actual, only in 1 Cor. vi. 11, Tit. iii. 7, and in Lk. xviii. 14. As in Rom. iii. 27ff so in Gal. ii. 16 it is stated emphatically that justification is not by *works of law;* and in Gal. iii. as in Rom. iv. the teaching that men are justified by faith is defended by an argument based on God's covenant with Abraham. With the doctrine of Justification by Faith is interwoven in each Epistle an exposition of the purpose and operation of the Law, and of a believer's relation to it. The Law proclaims a universal curse, and was designed to lead to transgressions and thus to shut up all men into helpless bondage from which they can be saved only by justification through faith: Gal. iii. 10, 19, 22f. It speaks in order to place all men guilty and silent at the bar of God; and came in that the first transgression might multiply, thus working wrath: Rom iii. 19f, v. 20, iv. 15. But the man of faith is dead to the Law: Gal. ii. 19, Rom. vi. 14. The essential principle of law, asserted in Lev. xviii. 5, reveals the total difference between salvation by law and by faith: Gal. iii. 12, Rom. x. 5. But that in this important matter the Epistles are by no means copies, is seen both in different ways of stating the same doctrine and in the various arguments with which it is defended. Of this, the exposition of Abraham's faith is a good example. The argument in Rom. iv. 10f that circumcision was later than the faith reckoned for righteousness finds a more fully developed counterpart in Gal. iii. 15, 17, where it is greatly strengthened by reference to human covenants. That the Law (Rom. iv. 14f) works wrath, and therefore would rob the promise of results if heirship came through law, is pleaded practically in Gal. iii. 10 and supported by a quotation from Dt. xxvii. 26. Rom. ix. 8f is a summing up of the argument developed in Gal. iv. 21—31, where we have again the son *born after the flesh* and the *children of promise.* The bondage caused by the Law, as the purpose of the Law is expounded in Gal. iii. 21ff, finds graphic delineation in Rom. vii. 14—25. In Gal. iii. 1—5 an argument from the story of Abraham is prefaced by an appeal to the early religious life of the readers; an appeal very appropriate to a writer who led them to Christ, but necessarily absent from a letter to the Roman Christians whom the writer had never seen.

6. The second chief matter of the Epistle to the Galatians, the contrast of *the flesh* and *the Spirit* as the two motive principles of human conduct, is equally conspicuous in the Epistle to the

Romans. Cp. Gal. v. 16, 25 with Rom. viii. 4; *v.* 18 with Rom. viii. 14; *v.* 24 with Rom. vii. 6; Gal. vi. 8 with Rom. viii. 13. And in this important doctrine also each Epistle supplements the other. In Rom. vii. 14—25 (cp. 'members of my body' twice in *v.* 23) we have a vivid picture of the mutual hostility asserted in Gal. v. 17. The crucifixion of *the flesh* in Gal. v. 24 explains the crucifixion of 'the old man' in Rom. vi. 6. The contrasted harvests of Gal. vi. 8 are a counterpart to Rom. vi. 21f: cp. *v.* 12.

This moral contrast of flesh and Spirit is found elsewhere in the New Testament only perhaps in Jno. iii. 6. But in a different, though related, sense, flesh and spirit are contrasted in 1 Cor. v. 5, 2 Cor. vii. 1. And the phrase *according to flesh*, so conspicuous in Rom. viii. 4f, 12f, (cp. Gal. iv. 23, 29,) is found in 2 Cor. i. 17, x. 2f; and in the same sense.

Both in Romans and Galatians the moral teaching of the Mosaic Law is summed up in the words of Lev. xix. 18.

7. Although in all four Epistles now under comparison the Death of Christ upon the Cross occupies the same unique place as the means of our salvation, yet the remarkable phrases *crucified with Christ*, *crucified to the world*, and *have crucified the flesh*, in Gal. ii. 20, vi. 14, v. 24, compared with 'our old man is crucified' in Rom. vi. 6, link together these two Epistles even as compared with the other Epistles of Paul. See Diss. vii. Not only are these phrases peculiar to Paul, but they belong to an important realm of thought peculiar to him and permeating his entire conception of the believer's relation to Christ, viz. union with Christ in His death, burial, resurrection and enthronement. Cp. Eph. ii. 5f, Col. ii. 20, 11—13, 2 Tim. ii. 11. This mode of viewing Christ's relation to us is not only absent from other New Testament writers, but, in spite of the great influence exerted by the teaching of Paul, has been assimilated only to a very small extent by later writers. Its conspicuous prominence in this Epistle is a clear mark of common origin with Rom. vi. 3—11.

Other slighter points of contact of the two Epistles are *fulness of time* in Gal. iv. 4 with 'in due season' in Rom. v. 6: the words *adoption*, *Abba Father*, and *son and heir* in Gal. iv. 5ff with Rom. viii. 15ff: *pronouncing blessed* in Gal. iv. 15 and Rom. iv. 6: *bear others' burdens* in Gal. vi. 2, Rom. xv. 1.

8. Very instructive, as revealing the close relation of these four Epistles, and especially of those to the Romans and Galatians,

is their use of the Old Testament. Even in the Epistles to the Corinthians, written to Gentiles and not treating specially of the Old Covenant, we have already found (see my *Corinthians* p. 491) abundant proof of the writer's deep familiarity with the Jewish Scriptures. And in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians we have the same Scriptures quoted, and expounded in a similar, though quite independent, manner. Each Epistle appeals to the story of Abraham, taking as a text Gen. xv. 6; also quotes Hab. ii. 4, and as contrast Lev. xviii. 5. A link uniting Gal. ii. 16 with Ps. cxliii. 2 is Rom. iii. 20. In Gal. v. 14 as in Rom. xiii. 9, Lev. xix. 18 is quoted as a chief foundation-stone of Christian morality. The allegory of Gal. iv. 22—31 is an expansion of the concise argument in Rom. ix. 8f.

9. The force of the above coincidences of language and of thought can be felt only by careful personal study. To be appreciated, the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians should first be compared; then these two Epistles with those to the Corinthians and with others bearing the name of Paul; and lastly, all these with the other parts of the New Testament. Such comparison will afford abundant indications that the four Epistles are from the same pen, and thus confirm the unanimous belief of all Churches in the latter part of the second century that they were written by the Apostle Paul; and will remove all possibility of doubt that the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians are products of the same mind and heart. And, if so, the various and irresistible evidence which compelled us to believe that each of the other three Epistles was written by Paul proves that the Epistle to the Galatians is also his work. These coincidences thus supply the lack of the personal notices which are so important a part of the evidence of authorship of the other Epistles. They complete the proof of genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians, a proof accepted as conclusive in all ages both by those who accept and those who reject the teaching of the great Apostle.

The close similarity of thought and expression also suggests that the two Epistles so closely related, viz. those to the Romans and the Galatians, were written under the same circumstances and about the same time. This matter now demands our attention.

DISSERTATION III.

THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

1. In my volume on *Corinthians* (p. 494) and that on *Romans* (p. 19) we found satisfactory proof that to the Corinthians Paul wrote from Ephesus at Easter and from Macedonia during the summer following, and to the Romans from Corinth during the next winter, the winter previous to his arrest at Jerusalem. Consequently, the three Epistles were written within a year.

2. From Gal. iv. 13 we inferred (see p. 124) that when writing the letter now before us Paul had already twice visited Galatia. And the narrative of the Book of Acts made us almost certain that these were the visits mentioned in Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23. Consequently, the Epistle was written not earlier than Paul's third missionary journey.

From Galatia Paul passed (Acts xix. 1) to Ephesus, where he spent three years. This long sojourn within 300 miles of Galatia by a direct route suggests that during this time Paul received unfavourable tidings about his converts there and at once wrote this letter to stop if possible the incipient apostacy. If so, this apostacy must have taken place soon after his second visit to Galatia. And this is somewhat confirmed by the word *quickly* in Gal. i. 6. This suggestion would also allow us to account for Paul's silence about the collection for Jerusalem by supposing that this letter was written before he took it in hand and gave (1 Cor. xvi. 1) directions about it to the Churches of Galatia. For these reasons many writers have accepted Paul's sojourn at Ephesus as the date of the Epistle. They therefore place it more than a year before the Epistle to the Romans.

3. Internal evidence points to a later date. The close similarity both of doctrine and argument, noted above, in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians reveals intense and sustained thought on one chief and one secondary topic, viz. Justification by Faith as Abraham was justified, and the flesh and Spirit as opposing factors of human life. Now the mental versatility of Paul makes it somewhat unlikely that these topics would occupy the prominent place in his thought which we find them holding in these Epistles, for a space of more than a year. And it is almost inconceivable that, during such period of sustained and concen-

trated thought, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, in neither of which we find any clear trace of these great doctrines, could have been written. The analogy of the similarly related Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, which seem (Eph. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7) to have been carried by the same messenger, Tychicus, suggests almost irresistibly that the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans were also written about the same time.

To this suggestion there is no serious objection. For, the word *quickly* in Gal. i. 6 is a relative term. To one whose every thought reached forward into eternity, seven or ten years would seem a very short time: see my note. The apostacy, apparently of whole Churches, may indeed have seemed to Paul a wonderfully early desertion of the faith so eagerly embraced. Again, although tidings from Galatia would much more easily reach Ephesus than Corinth whence Paul wrote to the Romans, yet communication between these two great seaports in the same latitude on opposite coasts of the Ægean Sea, was not difficult. Consequently, news reaching the Church at Ephesus might soon travel to Corinth. A greater difficulty is Paul's silence about the collection for Jerusalem. But our ignorance of details forbids us to base upon it a confident argument. Possibly the collection was already made: or, the unfaithfulness of the Church may have disinclined Paul to press it. Certainly these difficulties are less than the difficulty of supposing that the Epistles to the Corinthians were written between those to the Romans and the Galatians. On the other hand, if when Paul wrote this letter he had been lately engaged with a collection for poor Christians at Jerusalem, this may have called to his mind a promise made at Jerusalem many years before, and have prompted the somewhat unexpected reference to it in Gal. ii. 10. And his joyful meeting with Titus (2 Cor. vii. 6) in Macedonia, and probably the presence of Titus at Corinth during the winter following, would bring back to his mind the effort made at Jerusalem to compel Titus to be circumcised and Paul's own determined resistance to it.

4. Assuming now that the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians were written about the same time, we will further compare them with a view to their order in time. The chief argument of the latter Epistle was prompted by an emergency, the defection of the Galatian Christians: and the great doctrine thus forced by circumstances upon Paul's most serious attention becomes in the Epistle to the Romans the foundation stone of a complete and compact exposition of the Gospel. This suggests

that the Epistle to the Galatians was earlier than that to the Romans. In the former Epistle, Justification by Faith is the one doctrine discussed and defended at length: in the latter, it is the first of several doctrines fully expounded, and set forth in their mutual relations.

The easiest explanation of the whole case is that the exposition of Justification by Faith was evoked, as during the ages of Christianity statements of truth have again and again been evoked, by errors prevalent in Galatia, and was embodied roughly but forcefully, under pressure of the emergency, in the Epistle to the Galatians; and was afterwards worked up, in the mature thought of the Apostle, into the finished structure we see in the Epistle to the Romans. And the absence of this doctrine from the Epistles to Corinth suggests that when they were written Paul had not received the bad news from Galatia. We may suppose that on his arrival at Corinth in the autumn after the tumult at Ephesus he received news that under the influence of Jewish Christians residing in or visiting Galatia the entire Christian community there had wandered from the pure Gospel of Christ; that the news evoked in him, doubtless from materials already existing, the train of thought embodied in Gal. iii. 1—v. 6; that this doctrinal teaching found a needful supplement in the moral teaching of ch. v. 13—vi. 10, suggested possibly by the sensuality existing in the Church at Corinth; and that when the intended journey of Phœbe to Rome a month or two later gave Paul an opportunity of writing to the Christians there, in the absence of any special matter needing discussion in his letter, he developed, on the basis of the exposition sent to the Galatians of the great doctrine of Justification by Faith, the orderly system of Christian teaching which remains to us in the Epistle to the Romans. We may, therefore, in the absence of direct notes of time, such as those which enabled us to fix with approximate exactness the time and place of the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians, accept as probable that Paul wrote the letter before us at the close of A.D. 58, (according to the reckoning adopted in Diss. iii. of my *Corinthians*,) shortly after his arrival among his beloved yet wayward converts in the great and corrupt city of Corinth. Unfortunately, upon the state of the Church there this Epistle casts no light. The writer's entire thought is occupied by his spiritual children in far-off Galatia.

5. The Epistles bearing Paul's name arrange themselves in four very definite groups: the Epistles to the Thessalonians,

written on his second missionary journey, being separated by some five or six years from the Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans, written on his third journey; and these again separated by an interval of years from the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon, and the apparently still later Epistle to the Philippians, all written during his first great imprisonment; the closely related, and still later, Epistles to Timothy and Titus forming a fourth group. Each of these groups is marked by internal characteristics uniting the letters which compose it, and confirming certain notes of time which indicate their chronological order. The Epistle to the Galatians belongs to the second group; a conclusion placed beyond doubt by its close relation in tone and feeling to the Epistles to the Corinthians, and its still closer relation in teaching and argument to the Epistle to the Romans, this confirming the casual note of time in Gal. iv. 13 which separates the Epistle to the Galatians from those to the Thessalonians, and confirmed by the absence of all reference to captivity, (contrast Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20,) which suggests that it was earlier than the arrest at Jerusalem. This grouping of the Epistles notes theological differences; and is therefore far more important than the mere time and place at which each Epistle was written. And it rests upon a solid basis as indisputable fact.

DISSERTATION IV.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES COMPARED WITH THAT TO THE GALATIANS.

1. The Epistle of James presents, especially in one passage, a contrast to the Epistle to the Galatians so marked that our exposition of the teaching of Paul would be incomplete without a discussion of this apparently contradictory teaching. We shall therefore begin our comparison by attempting to expound this specially difficult passage.

2. That James speaks (ch. i. 3) of his readers' *manifold temptations* as a *proving of* their *faith*, implies that faith lies at the root of the Christian life. It is, in contrast to *doubt*, the condition (*v.* 6) of successful prayer: cp. ch. v. 15. The personal object of this faith is (ii. 1) *our Lord Jesus Christ.* James warns his readers that it must not be accompanied by

respect of persons, which is contrary to the *royal law* '*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*'

In ch. ii. 14 James unexpectedly introduces, by three questions, a series of arguments to prove that faith is useless if not accompanied by works. His first question assumes that faith is designed to be a means of *profit;* cp. 1 Cor. xv. 32: his second implies that the profit looked for is salvation. This last can be no other than rescue from the eternal penalty of sin: cp. v. 20, iv. 12, i. 21. For, rescue from the present power of sin would lie outside the vision of one who trusted to faith without works. *If a man say that he has faith*, leaves open the question whether there can be actual faith without works. But this is admitted in the second question; and in *v.* 19.

3. The third question, in *vv.* 15, 16, involves the first argument of the series. Its close bearing on *v.* 14*a* is indicated by the words *and one say* and *what is the profit?* The picture of a man, and still more a woman, and these members of the Christian family, shuddering in the cold and unable to obtain daily bread, yet receiving from those to whom they look for help only empty words of sympathy, forces upon us the universal truth that worthless are all dispositions of the heart which instead of producing action reveal themselves only in words. And this conviction is strengthened by the indignation the picture arouses. By quoting a case in which faith is not mentioned James bases his argument on a broad principle of various application. This wider principle he brings to bear in *v.* 17 on the specific matter in hand, viz. faith, by declaring that this vain sympathy finds a parallel in *faith if it have no works.* And the felt equality of mere words of sympathy and a mere profession of faith compels us to admit that his assertion is just.

The logical result of this first argument, James embodies in the word *dead;* in close accord with the same word in Rom. vii. 8, 'apart from law sin is dead.' Of life, activity and power are constant marks: consequently, compassion and faith which produce nothing but empty words may be justly called dead.

Second argument: *v.* 18. A man who expects salvation through faith without works is in the anomalous position of being unable to reply to any one he may meet who challenges proof of his profession of faith; and appears in ludicrous contrast to a man who, while making this challenge, appeals to his own works as witnesses of his faith.

A third argument (*v.* 19) is that faith without moral results

is found *also* in *the demons*, working in them awful fear, but evidently powerless to save. *That God is One*, is given as object-matter of the faith of the man who has no works. And assurance of this truth is called faith: *thou believest*. See my *Romans*, p. 142. But this faith is shared by demons; and indisputably does not profit them. It is true that the object-matter of it is only a statement about the nature of God, whereas the object-matter of justifying faith is the promise of eternal life to all who believe the Gospel. The one is belief of what God is; the other, of what He will do to us who believe. This latter faith is impossible to demons: for to them no promise is made. But this distinction James does not think fit to notice. For, the faith which produces no moral results always shrinks into mere belief of what God is. The Law spoken from Sinai and re-echoed in every man's heart prevents those who live in sin from believing the Gospel promise of God's favour and eternal life. And the universal congruity in the kingdom of God between a condition and the result dependent upon it assures us that a faith shared by lost spirits cannot save.

4. Fourth argument: *vv.* 20—24. The stately introduction in *v.* 20 marks suitably the transition from the casual arguments of *vv.* 16—19 to an important exposition of Scripture. That *faith without works is barren* (RV.) or better *without-result* or literally *without-works*, (same word in Mt. xii. 36, xx. 3, 6, 1 Tim. v. 13, Tit. i. 12, 2 Pet. i. 8: cognate word in Gal. iii. 17, v. 4, 11, Rom. iii. 3, 31, iv. 14, Lk. xiii. 7,) although it is a play upon words, is yet no truism but an all-important truth. For (cp. 'your work of faith,' 1 Th. i. 3) *the works* are actions prompted by faith now: the expected result of faith is (cp. 'profit' and 'save' in *v.* 14) rescue from the future penalty of sin. James declares that a faith which produces no result now will produce none hereafter. And his collocation of words does much to confirm their truth.

The question of *v.* 21 is practically an assertion that *Abraham was justified by works*, supported by an appeal to the story of the sacrifice of Isaac. To this story we must turn to learn the sense here of the word *justified*. For upon this depends the whole argument. In our search for it, the close similarity of the Epistle of James to the First Gospel affords a valuable clue. For in Mt. xii. 37 the words 'justify' and 'condemn' denote the final awards of the 'Day of Judgment.' And we are told that these awards will be determined even by a man's words. Here

then we have practically justification by works, (for a man's words belong to his outer life, i.e. to his works,) in the Gospel which in thought and tone stands nearest to the Epistle of James.

Since justification is a judge's favourable decision, we must look in Gen. xxii. for an utterance of the Great Judge. We find it in the solemn words of *vv.* 16—18, where God declares that, because Abraham has offered Isaac in sacrifice, He will fulfil the promises made to him years before. This declaration in his favour, Abraham obtained, undoubtedly, *by works*, viz. by his surrender of his son. In this sense then he *was justified by works*. Now Gen. xv. 6 teaches that the covenant with God, of which the great promises in Gen. xxii. 16—18 were the chief matter, was obtained by Abraham's faith. Consequently, Abraham obtained the blessings of the Covenant both by faith and by works. We *see* then *that faith wrought along with his works*.

The precise relation between these two co-operative causes, James describes by saying that *by works faith was made perfect*: i.e. (see under 2 Cor. xi. 15) from the offering of Isaac Abraham's faith derived its consummation, the attainment of its goal, the outworking of its inherent tendencies into full practical results. This great sacrifice was an outflow (cp. Heb. xi. 17) of Abraham's daring assurance long before Isaac was born that God will fulfil His promise and give him children as numerous as the stars. So wonderful was this faith that it must needs have a visible, and permanent, and worthy monument. Such monument was erected in the trial which revealed, by an act of obedience, the immovable strength of Abraham's assurance that God will fulfil His promise. And, appropriately, the trial took hold of the immediate object of Abraham's faith, viz. the child of promise. Without this outward trial something would have been lacking to the full development of Abraham's inward faith. And, since Abraham's faith was recorded in Gen. xv. 6, this *Scripture was fulfilled*, i.e. was realised in fact, in the sacrifice of Isaac. This makes apparent to all (*ye see*) the general principle that the approving award of the great Judge is obtained only by a faith associated with works. For, other faith is imperfect. And Abraham is both the father and the forerunner of all believers: consequently, since the blessings promised to him were obtained by a faith which had been tested by works, it is reasonable to infer that the eternal life promised in the Gospel can be obtained only by a faith similarly tested.

Exactly similar is the case of *Rahab*, which James adds to that of Abraham. That faith was the animating principle of her action, is proved by her profession of faith in Jos. ii. 11. But the belief which in demons is without result moved her to receive the messengers at her own great peril, and thus rescue them from death. Certainly the faith of Rahab was accompanied by works. The similar reference to Rahab in Heb. xi. 31 suggests that her case, as also that of Abraham, was frequently quoted in the early Church as an example of faith. That her faith was accompanied by works, is so clear that it needed not to be proved by any such argument as that in *vv.* 22, 23 about Abraham.

5. Verse 26 does not necessarily imply that faith bears to works a relation similar to that of *the body* to *the spirit*. For the chief thought here is separation: *apart from spirit, apart from works*. United, the body and spirit are alive: separated, *the body is dead*. And from the felt worthlessness of compassion without practical help and of profession not verified by corresponding action, from the example of lost spirits who have as much faith as those who trust to faith without works, and from two favourite Old Testament examples of faith, James has proved that separated from works faith is like a human body destitute of life. This mention of a lifeless body suggests the moral corruption which follows empty profession of faith.

The argument is now clear. A faith utterly unlike the faith of Abraham and Rahab, and precisely the same as the powerless faith of lost spirits, cannot 'save a soul from death,' and is therefore of no profit whatever.

6. Comparison of the above teaching with that of Paul reveals at once his different use of the word *justify*; or rather reminds us that he uses it in a sense found in the rest of the New Testament only in Lk. xviii. 14, viz. as already possessed on earth. And this is no mere verbal peculiarity; but embodies an important conception of truth peculiar to Paul. James teaches that the favourable award of the Great Judge on the Great Day proclaiming salvation from the due penalty of sin of which all men are guilty is given only to those whose faith, like Abraham's, has revealed itself in actual obedience; and that in this sense a man is justified by works and not by faith only. Even Paul, when speaking only of the Law and before mention of the Gospel, himself uses in Rom. ii. 13 similar language. But Paul saw that the Gospel is as much a voice of the Great Judge as will be the final

award from the great white throne. We need not wait till that Day to know our destiny. Christ has already declared that all who believe His words shall have, and have already, eternal life. He thus proclaims their actual and present justification. And they have been justified (Rom. iii. 28) by faith apart from works. For as soon as they believe, even before their faith has had time to show itself in works, they are accepted by God as righteous, adopted into His family, and in token thereof receive the Holy Spirit crying in their hearts Abba, Father. The Spirit thus received breathes into their faith life and power and activity: whereas apart from the Spirit their faith would be powerless. The Holy Spirit, hidden in the heart, bears fruit; and reveals His presence in works of faith. But these works are a result, not a previous condition, of justification. And the end is eternal life. Should these results not follow justification, or should they cease, the grieved Spirit will depart and faith will shrink into the empty and powerless form described by James. Paul therefore declares, in close agreement with the teaching of James, emphatically and repeatedly (1 Cor. vi. 10, Gal. v. 21) that they who commit sin will not inherit the Kingdom of God. From this we infer that good works, the fruit of the Spirit, though by their nature and origin they cannot be a condition of first obtaining the preliminary justification on earth, are yet a condition of its permanence and of its consummation in the final justification on the Great Day.

7. It is now evident that between James and Paul there is no essential contradiction. But the point of view is altogether different. We cannot conceive either of them to write as the other has done.

In order to give a firm ground of hope even to those who like himself have been high-handed enemies of the Gospel, Paul proclaims pardon apart from works for all who believe. For a moral corrective of this doctrine he trusts to his teaching about the flesh and the Spirit, as in Gal. v. 16—vi. 10; and about the believer's union with Christ in death to sin, thus being set free from deadly bondage, as in Rom. vi. On the other hand, in the mind of James, who all his life probably had endeavoured to serve God, the doctrine of forgiveness apart from works had not become an all-absorbing thought as in the mind of Paul: whereas intense consciousness of right and wrong made him ever mindful that the practical worth of faith and of all religious or benevolent sentiment is measured by their practical effect upon our action. Paul

could never forget that in the Gospel the Great Judge had already spoken the sinner's acquittal. This acquittal, obtained by faith, he therefore called justification. James ever remembered that the new birth (Jas. i. 18) by no means ends our probation, but rather begins a new probation; and that even the servants of Christ will be judged (ch. ii. 12) at the (v. 7) coming of the Lord. He therefore reserved the word justification for the Judge's final approbation. In the Epistle of James the aspect of truth most familiar to him engrosses the writer's thought so completely that the complementary truth underlying Paul's phraseology is not mentioned. Consequently, although we find substantially in the many Epistles of Paul the teaching of James, we do not find in this one short Epistle the teaching which lay nearest to the heart of Paul.

By proclaiming very forcibly that the Gospel does not revoke the unchanging principles of human morality, and by confining our attention to this one aspect of religion, leaving for the moment all else out of sight, the Epistle of James is of great and abiding value. But, had it stood alone, it would have done little or nothing to save those who are already conscious of the guilt and penalty of sin. Its value is almost exclusively that of a preparation and a corrective to the teaching of Paul and John.

We notice that James does not speak of *works of law*, i.e. of the absolute conformity to its prescriptions which the Law demands. Such works no one can perform. He teaches merely that faith must reveal itself in action. Moreover, like Paul but unlike modern theologians, James does not discuss the psychological nature of saving faith as distinguished from faith which does not save. Such distinctions, though needful for the scientific theologian, only confuse seekers after salvation. It is sufficient for James to say that in order to save us faith must be accompanied by works.

8. The rest of the Epistle presents as compared with the writings of Paul no special difficulties. 'The Spirit which He made dwell in us' in Jas. iv. 5 is a close coincidence with the constant teaching of Paul, e.g. 1 Cor. iii. 16. In Jas. ii. 5 we have the doctrine of election, in an aspect very similar to 1 Cor. i. 27. The quotation of Lev. xix. 18 in Jas. ii. 8 is a close parallel with Gal. v. 14, Rom. xiii. 9; and is a remarkable point of contact of James and Paul. It is a counterpart to Gen. xv. 6, which is also quoted in the same three Epistles: Jas. ii. 23, Rom. iv 3, Gal. iii. 6. This suggests that these two passages from

the Old Testament were frequently appealed to in the apostolic Church. And the former quotation confirms the correctness of Mt. xxii. 39, Mk. xii. 31, Lk. x. 27, where in the same sense as in these Epistles the same words are said to have been quoted by Christ. And, throughout, the Epistle of James strongly confirms the First Gospel by presenting a type of teaching identical with that recorded there as having fallen from the Master's own lips.

DISSERTATION V.

THE GOSPEL AND FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN COMPARED WITH THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

1. Our comparison of the Epistle to the Galatians with that of James suggests a comparison with another very marked type of New Testament teaching, viz. that presented by the Gospel and First Epistle of John.

2. Very different from the conception of the work and teaching of Christ embodied in the other three Gospels is that delineated in the Fourth Gospel. And the First Epistle of John is a series of meditations on the words there recorded as spoken by Christ. The close similarity of these two documents removes all doubt that they are from the same pen. Various notices of persons and time suggest very strongly that the Gospel was written by an eye-witness of the scenes described. And the choice and arrangement of the words of Christ and the writer's introductory and occasional remarks about Him, and his profound exposition in the First Epistle of the words recorded in the Gospel, reveal a mind and heart of the loftiest kind.

That both documents were written by the beloved disciple, is, although they are anonymous, assumed without a shadow of doubt in the latter part of the second century by Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenæus, e.g. bk. iii. 1. 1, 16. 5—8; and is asserted in the Fragment of Muratori. And in still earlier writers we have less definite references. Whereas, no trace of doubt about their authorship is found in any early writer. Of this confident, wide-spread, and uncontradicted belief, in all parts of the Roman Empire within a hundred years of his death, the only explanation is that these works were actually written by the

Apostle John. Moreover we cannot conceive a writer such as their author must have been hiding himself so completely that of his name or place or action no trace should survive. This unanimous belief finds for the Gospel and Epistle a worthy author; and for the disciple whom Jesus loved a worthy and abiding monument. The proofs of authorship, consisting as they do of minute particulars which cannot be reproduced in detail, are not so concise and therefore not so convincing at first sight as were the combined proofs, external and internal, historical and doctrinal, which forbad us to doubt that the four Epistles I have annotated are from the pen of Paul. Nor is there among modern scholars the same agreement about the authorship of these two works. But the cumulative force of the minute indications of authorship, taken in connection with the unanimous belief of the Early Church and with the proved genuineness of the four Epistles, is immense. That both documents were written by the Apostle John, is to me the only conceivable explanation of the whole facts of the case. The entire subject is discussed very ably in the contributions to *The Speaker's Commentary* by Westcott and to *The Cambridge Bible for Schools* by Plummer, and in Godet's *Commentary on St. John's Gospel.*

The authorship of the Book of Revelation is surrounded by special difficulties. And, as its type of teaching differs very much from that presented in the Gospel and First Epistle of John, I shall not bring it into the present comparison. Nor will it be needful to compare the short Second and Third Epistles of John, although we have good reason to believe that they were written by the author of the First Epistle.

3. We now consider the relation of faith to salvation in the Gospel and First Epistle of John. On the threshold of the Gospel we read that 'to those who believe' Christ 'has given a right to become children of God:' Jno. i. 12. This implies that believers already possess the favour of the Great Judge. In Jno. iii. 15 and again in *v.* 16 faith is, in the purpose of God, the single condition of 'eternal life.' While others are (*v.* 18) 'already condemned' and (*v.* 36) under 'the anger of God,' against him that believes no sentence is pronounced, and he 'has eternal life.' We are therefore emphatically told in ch. v. 24 that he 'has passed out of death into life.' From v. 22, 27 we infer that in giving life to believers Christ acts as Judge. In ch. vi. 29 faith occupies a unique place as 'the' one 'work' which 'God' requires; in close accord with Rom. iii. 27, 'the

law of faith.' Similar teaching in Jno. vi. 35, 40, 47. In ch. vii. 38f we have the astounding promise that from within those who believe, by the Holy Spirit given to them, 'will flow rivers of living water.' They who do not believe will die in their sins: viii. 24. At the grave of Lazarus Christ taught with emphatic repetition that he who believes shall escape death: xi. 25, 26. Similarly, he that believes will perform works greater than those of the incarnate Son: xiv. 12. Disbelief of Christ is the world's great sin: xvi. 9. Faith in Christ, and through faith eternal life, were the purpose for which the Fourth Gospel was written: xx. 31.

In 1 Jno. ii. 12 we find persons whose sins are already forgiven, who are already (iii. 1, 2) children of God, and (*v.* 14: cp. Jno. v. 24) have passed out of death into life. This is explained in 1 Jno. v. 1, 4f, where we learn that all believers are 'begotten from God;' and that faith involves victory over the world. The Epistle was written (*v.* 13) to those that believe, that they may know that they have eternal life.

The above passages give to faith, as the one condition of eternal life, a place absolutely unique, and as conspicuous as its place in the Epistles of Paul. They involve also his doctrine of Justification by Faith; and they trace it in essence to the lips of Christ. For, the solemn declaration that all who believe have now eternal life, whereas formerly they were condemned and virtually dead, is the voice of the Judge, and is therefore a judicial decision in their favour; or is in other words their justification. By faith they entered the number of the justified. They are therefore already justified by faith. And although this phrase is not found in the writings of John it is suggested by Jno. v. 21—30, where apparently Christ's formal proclamation of life eternal for those who believe is called a raising of the dead, and this is said to be a judicial act.

This teaching is by John and by Christ guarded from abuse by the often repeated command that Christians love each other, and by the emphatic teaching of 1 Jno. iii. 9ff, Jno. viii. 39ff that sin and everything contrary to love are marks of the children of the devil and that the children of God are known by their works. Like 2 Cor. v. 10, Rom. ii. 6, so Jno. v. 29 announces a final judgment by Christ according to works.

The Holy Spirit is as prominent in the writings of John as in the Epistles of Paul. He is promised to those who believe in Christ: Jno. vii. 39. To Him is attributed, as in Gal. iv. 6,

Rom. viii. 8—16 so in 1 Jno. iii. 24, iv. 13, the believer's consciousness of spiritual life. He is the source of the new birth: Jno. iii. 3, 5, 8. And on the eve of His death Christ specially promised that in His disciples henceforth and for ever the Spirit should dwell, that His coming should be to them a return of the Risen Saviour and that He should guide them into all truth: Jno. xiv. 16f, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13f.

A close agreement of Paul and John is their designation of believers as children of God: Jno. i. 12, xi. 52; 1 Jno. iii. 1f, 10, v. 2. In John, however, this new relation to God is traced to a new birth, as in Jno. i. 13, iii. 3—8, 1 Jno. v. 1: a doctrine touched by Paul only once casually in Tit. iii. 5, but found in Jas. i. 18, 1 Pet. i. 23. On the other hand, Paul teaches that believers are sons of God by adoption, Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 5, 7, Eph. i. 5; a Roman citizen thus using a common Roman custom to describe a new relation to God. To this teaching, Jno. i. 12 is an approach.

The phrase *in Christ*, which embodies as we have seen a profound and all-pervading thought in the mind of Paul, is equally conspicuous in the writings of John, where however it bears a very definite mark peculiar to the beloved disciple. And it is there traced to the Master's lips. At Capernaum, after feeding the multitude, Christ spoke the mysterious words of Jno. vi. 56: 'He that eats My flesh and drinks My blood abides in Me, and I in him.' And after the last Supper, to the sorrowing apostles he said, in ch. xv. 4, 'Abide in Me and I in you;' explaining His words by pointing to the vine and its branches. The seed-thought thus uttered bore abundant fruit in the mind of one who on that memorable night lay on the bosom of His Lord; fruit found in 1 Jno. ii. 6, 24, 27, 28, iii. 6, 24, iv. 13, 16, and indirectly elsewhere. This coincidence of thought and expression is the more remarkable because this phrase, found in each Epistle bearing the name of Paul except the short letter to Titus and with a distinctive setting in the Gospel and First Epistle of John, is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

4. The chief doctrinal features of the Epistle to the Galatians, we have now found, in form or in essence, equally conspicuous in the writings of John; and have there traced them to the lips of Christ. We have thus independent evidence from the two great theologians of the New Testament that these doctrines were actually taught by Christ. For only thus can we account for their firm hold of, and complete control over, men differing so

widely in mental constitution, vocation, and surroundings, as Paul and the writer of the Fourth Gospel. This doctrinal coincidence is, therefore, proof that this Gospel is in the main a correct report of words spoken by Christ. Indeed, the discourses therein recorded are a necessary connecting link between Paul and Christ. For, only on the supposition that He spoke such words as these can we account for Paul's conception of the Gospel. Had we only the discourses recorded in the First Gospel, this conception would be to us an insoluble mystery. But now all is explained. We can easily conceive that the Synoptic Gospels embody Christ's ordinary public teaching, which was for the more part a reproduction and development of the moral teaching of the Old Testament. But together with this ordinary teaching He spoke, privately as to Nicodemus and to the apostles on the night of His betrayal, or occasionally in public as in the discourse (Jno. vi.) at Capernaum, words setting forth the Gospel in its fulness. And the record of this teaching was appropriately confided to the beloved disciple. The teaching of the Synoptists was in some measure understood at the time, and is widely appreciated now. The words recorded by John could be understood, even by those who heard them, only when expounded by the Spirit promised to the disciples: and to this day the Fourth Gospel is a sealed book to many who value greatly the teaching of the other Gospels. But in all ages it has been the richest nourishment of the most devout of the followers of Christ.

It will be noticed that the above argument confirms somewhat our other proof that the Fourth Gospel was written by the Apostle John.

All this by no means implies that Paul derived his conception of the work and teaching of Christ from the Fourth Gospel or from the Apostle John; but simply that this Gospel reproduces correctly the thought of Christ. Through what channel this thought was by the Spirit of Christ conveyed to Paul, we cannot now determine. And, since we have found in the recorded teaching of Jesus the root of all that Paul teaches, the connecting medium is unimportant.

In close accord with the writings of Paul and John, and in spite of total dissimilarity of thought and phrase, we find faith occupying a unique place as the one condition of blessing in Lk. i. 45, Mk. i. 15, Lk. viii. 12f, Mk. xvi. 16; and as an abiding condition of miraculous healing and of answer to prayer in

Mt. viii. 13, ix. 28f, xvii. 20, Lk. xvii. 6; Mt. xxi. 21f, Mk. xi. 23f. Of this teaching, the doctrine of Justification by Faith is but a full development.

DISSERTATION VI.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

1. We will now sum up and further discuss the results of our study of Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith, the chief matter of the Epistle to the Galatians.

2. We have already seen (*Romans* p. 110) that the word *justify* denotes a judge's award in a man's favour. It is therefore used in Mt. xii. 37 by Christ and in Rom. ii. 13 by Paul for the final approbation pronounced by the Great Judge on the Last Day. That this approbation will be given only to those who have done right, various New Testament writers agree: Mt. vii. 21—27, xxv. 35; Jno. v. 29; Rom. ii. 6, 2 Cor. v. 10; Rev. xxii. 12. And, to prove this, is the purpose of the argument in Jas. ii. 14—26. In this sense then justification, i.e. the justification of the Great Day, will be by works, by actual right-doing. With this agree Gen. xxii. 16ff, xxvi. 5, where the blessings of the Old Covenant are solemnly declared to be a reward of Abraham's obedience.

3. In Jas. ii. 22 we learn from the case of Abraham that the works which justify are co-workers with faith: and are an outward realisation of faith. This implies that without faith Abraham would not have performed the works which wrought his justification. Similarly, Paul teaches that by faith (Gal. iii. 14) we obtain the Holy Spirit, and sonship (*v.* 26) attested by (iv. 6) the gift of the Spirit of the Son; and that the Spirit then received gives (Rom. viii. 13) victory over sin, is the guide (Gal. v. 16) of our action, and a seed (*v.* 22) from which springs every moral excellence. Consequently, faith is the ultimate source on man's side of the good works which will in the Great Day obtain the Judge's approval, and of the justification then pronounced. Hence both faith and works are conditions, and in this sense means, of final justification. Compare the example of Rahab in the Epistle of Clement of Rome ch. i. 12, quoted in my *Corinthians* p. 521.

4. Christ proclaimed again and again, as recorded in the

Fourth Gospel, that all who believe in Him shall have, and already have, eternal life, and have 'passed out of death into life.' And this proclamation He speaks of as an act of 'judgment.' Our Lord thus gives to faith a unique place as the one means of the favour of God. Paul saw that this proclamation is a present justification of all who believe in Christ. These have no need to wait until the Great Day in order to know their destiny. In the words of the Gospel the Judge has already spoken to them, and in their favour. They are therefore already justified. And, since the proclamation is for all believers and for them only, by believing the words of Jesus they entered the number of those whom He declares to be justified. In other words they were justified by faith. Moreover, the proclamation availed for them in the moment they believed and before there had been time for faith to show itself in works. Otherwise, not all believers would have eternal life. They were therefore in the moment of their faith justified by faith apart from works. And this is repeatedly and expressly asserted by Paul.

This present justification brings peace with God, and a joyous hope of future glory: Rom. v. 1, 11.

5. We have therefore two justifications; one preliminary, the other final. The one is obtained by believing the words of Jesus: the other, by obeying the commands of God. But these justifications are most closely related each to the other. For the preliminary justification has no worth unless it be an anticipation of the final award. And the obedience required for that final award is an outflow of the faith which first brought justification. In each of these senses, in reference to a justification already enjoyed even by one who a moment before had confessed himself a sinner, and in reference to the justification of the Great Day which will be obtained by right-doing on earth, the word *justify* is used by Christ: Lk. xviii. 14, Mt. xii. 37.

With these two uses of the word *justify* correspond two very conspicuous threads of teaching which run almost throughout the New Testament. We are frequently taught, in plainest and most emphatic language, that only they who obey God have His favour and are in the way of life. So Mt. vii. 21—27, xix. 17, xxv. 35f, 42f; Rom. ii. 6f, vi. 16, 23, 1 Cor. vi. 9f, vii. 19, 2 Cor. v. 10, Gal. vi. 7f; Jno. viii. 39, 1 Jno. ii. 3—5, 9—11, iii. 6—10, 14f, v. 3. And this teaching is re-echoed in our hearts by the law written there. It thus becomes a voice we cannot contradict or doubt. Yet in language equally emphatic Christ declares in

the Fourth Gospel (see p. 211) that all who believe have eternal life, thus making faith the one condition of salvation: and Paul teaches that we are justified by faith apart from works of law. These two threads of teaching we find running side by side in conspicuous contrast throughout the writings of John and of Paul.

6. To harmonize these apparently different types of teaching, or rather to reach the one broad truth which underlies and unites them, is the difficult and pressing task of the theologian. The solemn and repeated teaching of the various New Testament writers proves indisputably that the earlier justification by faith does not in any way supersede the later justification by works, and that the present favour of God is possessed only by those who obey His commands. On the other hand, this final judgment according to works cannot invalidate the promise of life to all who believe. No harmony will satisfy us which does not give to each of these lines of teaching full and independent force.

The harmony is found in the contents of that word of God which is the object-matter of justifying faith, taken in connection with the mental and moral constitution of man. The Gospel is not a mere declaration concerning God, but a declaration of what God now does and will do to us who believe. It is a proclamation that God now receives into His favour and family and makes heirs of eternal life all who believe His proclamation. Consequently, our faith is an assurance resting upon the word and truth of God that through the death of Christ we have now the approbation of God, are His sons by adoption, and already possess a life which will develop into the endless joy of heaven. Now, to all who commit or love sin, this assurance is made impossible by the Voice which spoke in thunder at Sinai, a thunder re-echoed from the lips of Him who came to speak the Gospel of peace and re-echoed now in the hearts of all men with an authority they cannot gainsay, and which proclaims that on all who sin God frowns. All such are thus excluded from faith, and therefore from the number of the justified. The Law of God is an angel-sentinel with sword of flame guarding the way to Justification by Faith. It closes every path to the Tree of Life except that of repentance. Only they who resolve to forsake sin can believe that God now receives them into His favour: only they who actually conquer sin can believe that they have His abiding smile. Consequently, as a preliminary condition of justifying faith, repentance, i.e. the purpose to forsake sin, is

also a condition of justification. It is therefore a part of the message of life: Lk. xxiv. 47, Acts ii. 38, xx. 21, xxvi. 20. On the other hand, victory over sin is God's gift, wrought by the Holy Spirit given to all who believe the Gospel promise.

The above harmony retains in their full sense both sides of the New Testament teaching about justification. All who believe the Gospel are justified in the moment of their faith: yet only they who obey God have His favour. Consequently, even in our sins, yet weary of and anxious to be saved from them, we dare to believe the proclamation of pardon for all who believe, assured that God will work in us by His Spirit the new life which He requires. Indeed not otherwise can we obey God: for obedience is a fruit of the Spirit, given to the adopted sons. Nor are we kept waiting till our faith has proved itself in works. At once, by faith, we are numbered among the justified; and in witness thereof we receive the Holy Spirit. He moves us to obey, and gives power to do so. They who yield to His influences find in their own inner life a confirmation of their faith. They who resist Him are prevented, by their consciousness of this resistance, from believing that God smiles on them.

It is now clear that, although faith occupies a unique place as apart from works the one condition of justification, yet obedience is practically an essential condition also. In other words, the faith which justifies must show itself in works, or it will not (Jas. ii. 14) eventually save. Yet, as we have seen, justification was obtained at first not by works, even the good works which flow from faith, but simply by faith apart from and before works. The works which follow faith are results, not a condition, of justification. Similarly, our assurance of the continued favour of God rests, not upon our consciousness of having obeyed the commands of God, but simply and only upon the word of Christ proclaiming that all who believe shall have, and already have, eternal life. At the same time believers detect with gratitude a moral change in their inner and outer life. And this felt change they joyfully accept as confirmation of the faith they ventured to exercise before they felt in themselves any moral change whatever, and as an earnest of greater moral development yet to come. But this moral change is at best utterly insufficient to be a ground of assurance of God's favour or hope of heaven. For God requires absolute obedience, which none can say that he has rendered. Christian confidence rests simply upon the word of God Himself. Thus, throughout the Christian's life, justifi-

cation is by faith apart from works; although without works there can be no abiding justification.

7. The moral Nature of God makes it impossible that He would have proclaimed justification for all who believe had He not resolved to work in all believers a moral change. For God cannot smile on those who live in sin. By this moral change, Justification by Faith is itself justified. God's Holiness demands absolute devotion, involving absolute obedience, in all His intelligent creatures. Consequently, only so far as this devotion is yielded is there right relation between man and God. Yet, without demanding such devotion as a previous condition, God accepts as righteous all who believe. He justifies this acceptance by giving to them the Holy Spirit who ever prompts the devotion God requires; and by writing in the hearts of all men moral principles which necessarily destroy faith in those who refuse to follow the guidance of the Spirit. Consequently, subsequent obedience is an essential element of Justification by Faith.

8. The faith which justifies can be no other than simple assurance that the words of Christ proclaiming life present and future for all believers are true and will come true. Such assurance is a resting upon the known character and love of God manifested in the death of Christ. See my *Romans* p. 145. Indeed all belief of a promise is self-surrender, in a measure determined by the greatness of the promise and of the interests at stake, to the ability and trustworthiness of the speaker. All else in the Christian life is wrought by the Spirit given to those who believe, and is therefore a result of foregoing justification; not a part of justifying faith. Consequently, the results of faith, e.g. hope and love, cannot be conditions of justification. They are its results.

9. Since all men are sinners, justification is practically pardon of the guilty. Consequently, the doctrine that believers are already justified is implied in many passages which speak of forgiveness of sins: e.g. Mk. i. 4, Lk. iii. 3; Mt. xxvi. 28; Lk. xxiv. 47; Acts ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43, xxvi. 18; Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, ii. 13; 1 Jno. i. 9, ii. 12. For, that guilty ones are forgiven, implies that the judge has spoken in their favour. These passages confirm, therefore, the teaching of Paul and John that believers are already justified, and have eternal life.

10. In the foregoing exposition, we have found in the New Testament two interwoven threads of teaching about the means or condition of the favour of God; one presented most conspicuously in the First Gospel and the Epistle of James where we

learn that God looks with favour only on those who obey His commands, and the other presented most conspicuously in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans where Paul teaches in plainest language that justification comes through faith apart from works of law. But we have also found that the teaching of Paul is only another form of teaching again and again attributed to Christ in the Fourth Gospel: and we have found points of contact with it in the other Gospels and in the Book of Acts. We have also found the teaching of the First Gospel repeated in unmistakable and very strong language in the Epistles of Paul and the First Epistle of John. These apparently contradictory types of teaching, we have endeavoured to harmonize by showing that the Law makes initial faith impossible except to those who sincerely desire to forsake sin, and abiding faith impossible except to those who actually overcome it; and by pointing to the Holy Spirit given to all who believe to work in them the obedience which God requires. Thus each type of teaching supplements the other, and guards it from perversion. Otherwise, the former type would bring only condemnation: and the latter would overturn morality.

11. Christian opinion about Justification has varied as men have laid chief weight upon one or other of these types of New Testament teaching. Of these varieties of opinion Luther's *Commentary on Galatians* and the *Decree on Justification* of the Council of Trent (6th session) may be taken as extreme representatives.

With the teaching of Paul in the matter of Justification as expounded in this volume, Luther is, in the main, in complete and hearty accord. Again and again and in strongest language he asserts (see his note on Gal. ii. 16) with Paul that "faith justifies without and before love." That faith must and will be followed by good works, he constantly teaches; but shuts out all good works as a ground of the favour of God. He says correctly, "when a man hears that he ought indeed to believe in Christ but that faith does not justify unless love is added, he at once loses faith." So deeply did he feel that no secure ground of confidence can be found in anything we have done, but only in the work and death of Christ, that he excludes utterly from justification all thought of the Law or of obedience. In all this it seems to me that Luther is, both in thought and expression, in close accord with Paul. That for which Paul fought so earnestly at Jerusalem, at Antioch, and in this Epistle, was Luther's great

contention. And this doctrine, not a mere correction of abuses, evoked the marvellous outburst of spiritual life in Luther's day: and bears abundant fruit now in all Protestant Churches.

But Luther goes on to say, on the ground of Gal. ii. 16, that even if a man could keep the whole Law he would not thereby be justified; and declares that even with the grace of God none can perfectly obey God. So under Gal. v. 16: "because sin clings to you, while you live it is impossible that you fulfil the Law." Of these assertions, the former is purely theoretical: for no one will claim the favour of God on the ground that he has kept the Law. The latter is, if not untrue, yet very inexpedient to say, and opposed to the tenor of Rom. viii. 4. Rather should we say that whatever God bids He will give power to do, or with Paul in Phil. iv. 13, 'I can do all things in Him who makes me strong.' Luther's unproved assertion leaves us content with imperfect obedience: the bold works of Paul urge us to claim as God's gift power to do whatever we know to be right. At the same time no one can by obedience obtain the favour of God: for all good works are results of His favour already obtained. And this important truth prompted, and is some apology for, the exaggerated assertion of Luther. This exaggeration, and others similar, are nevertheless flaws in the teaching of the Great Reformer; and have opened to his opponents points of attack, thus weakening the strength of his teaching about justification. But his teaching must be judged as a whole. And as a whole it is in very close accord with that of Paul.

The teaching of the Roman Church is set forth at great length in the *Decree on Justification* of the Council of Trent, Sixth Session, 13th Jan. 1547. This Decree is the more worthy of attention because it was specially designed to combat the teaching of Luther and his followers. In ch. 7, the Fathers at Trent define Justification to be "not only remission of sins but also sanctification and renovation of the inner man through willing reception of grace and gifts; whence from unrighteous a man becomes righteous, from an enemy a friend, that he may be heir according to the hope of eternal life." This differs from the definition of Justification accepted at the beginning of this Dissertation. But, since the Holy Spirit is given to those who believe in order to work in them conformity to the Law of God, the difference is only verbal.

A more serious difference follows. Deeply conscious that without doing right we cannot have the favour of God, and

perhaps moved by immoral perversions of the teaching of Luther, the Council taught that "faith, unless hope be added to it and love, neither unites perfectly with Christ nor makes one a living member of His body. For which reason it is most truly said that faith without works is dead and inoperative, and in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything nor uncircumcision but faith which works through love." This view of Justification, which is put forth as a complete account of it and is not modified or supplemented by other teaching, seems to me to be not far removed from, and tending towards, the justification by works of law which in Gal. iii. 10ff Paul proves to be impossible. For the Decree speaks, not of justification at the Great Day, but again and again of justification as a present, though very indefinite benefit. It is quite true that without hope and love there is no abiding and perfect union with Christ. But this union is obtained (Eph. iii. 17) by faith, never by hope and love. For, though ever accompanying it, these are results, and therefore cannot be means, of union with Christ.

The practical effect of the above teaching is seen in ch. 9: "No one, boasting confidence and certainty of remission of sins and resting in that only, should say that his sins are or have been remitted." Then follows a mixture of error and truth: "Nor should it be asserted that they who are truly justified ought without any doubt at all to determine with themselves that they are justified, and that no one is absolved from sins and justified except he who believes certainly that he is absolved and justified and that by this faith alone absolution and justification are effected." In other words, while rightly condemning those who declare that none are justified except those who know it, the Council practically shuts out all assurance of justification, and condemns to doubt those who accept its teaching. Fortunately by many in the Church of Rome this teaching is supplemented and unconsciously modified by the plain words of Paul and John. But I cannot doubt that it has caused widespread and serious injury.

In ch. 11, the Council rightly says: "No one to whatever degree justified ought to reckon himself to be free from observance of the commandments: no one ought to use that rash word forbidden under anathema by the Fathers, 'God's precepts cannot possibly be observed by a justified man.' For God does not command impossible things; but by commanding admonishes both to do what thou canst and to seek for what thou canst not do, and helps thee that thou mayest be able to do it. Whose

commands are not heavy: whose yoke is easy and His burden light." These good words reveal the error of Luther's contrary assertions.

We need not hesitate to join the Council, ch. 16, in attributing to works done under the guidance of the Spirit a certain merit, in the sense of appropriateness for reward. But both the actions rewarded and whatever merit belongs to them are gifts of God's undeserved favour in Christ. So the Decree well says: "Whose goodness toward all men is so great that what are His own gifts He calls their merits."

12. Reviewing the whole subject we hold firmly that Justification is obtained simply by faith, before faith has attested itself by any good works or has produced even hope or love, that unless justification is followed by obedience the faith by which it is obtained and retained will die and our justification be lost, and yet that even while in some measure, and in an increasing measure, obeying the commands of God we rely for His favour not at all upon our obedience but simply on His word which promises, through the death of Christ, life to all who believe.

13. The doctrine of Justification, thus understood, has a bearing far wider than at first sight appears. Taught by the Spirit of God, the justified see more clearly day by day the path in which God would have them go, and the image of Christ which God would have reproduced in them. And this clearer vision reveals their own defect, and their powerlessness to supply it. Yet they know that only so far as God's will is the rule of their life do they practically enjoy His favour. In their felt spiritual helplessness they cast themselves on the word and will of God: and with the faith by which as sinners they first obtained forgiveness they now claim and obtain a realisation, in proportion to their knowledge and faith, of God's will concerning them. Thus does the faith which in their deep unrighteousness God mercifully reckoned to them for righteousness attain its consummation by working in them conformity to the Law of God: and this conformity is the mature development of the righteousness reckoned to them in the moment of their faith. This outworking of faith reveals its appropriateness as the one condition, even apart from works, of Justification.

On the whole subject, a mass of information may be found in the *Lectures on Justification* by Cardinal Newman, written when an Anglican and annotated and republished after he joined the Church of Rome.

DISSERTATION VII.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST.

1. The death of Christ upon the cross occupies in the teaching of Paul a position as conspicuous as, and closely connected with, that of the doctrine of Justification by Faith. This all-important teaching, in this connection, we will now consider. We shall thus supplement the note under Rom. iii. 26. Full discussion of it must, however, be postponed till we have before us the teaching of the remaining Epistles of Paul.

2. From Rom. v. 9f we learn that our justification and reconciliation come through Christ's blood and death, and that (*vv.* 6, 8) for this end Christ died: and on these repeated and emphatic statements rests an important argument. This strange and tremendous means, God adopted (Rom. iii. 26) in order to reconcile our justification with His own justice: a clear proof of its absolute necessity. This purpose explains, and is the only explanation of, the repeated statements that Christ died for us, and the importance everywhere attached to the death of Christ: cp. Rom. xiv. 15, 1 Cor. viii. 11, i. 13, 18, 23, Rom. viii. 34. Since Christ's death harmonized our justification with God's justice, it was caused by our sins: so 1 Cor. xv. 3, Rom. iv. 25, Gal. i. 4; and especially Gal. iii. 13, where Christ becomes Himself a curse in order to rescue us from the curse pronounced by the Law on all who break any one of its commands. For justice is the attribute of God specially offended by man's sin. Since Christ saved us from the due penalty of our sins by Himself bearing it, He may be said to have died in our stead. And this is plainly implied in Gal. iii. 13, 2 Cor. v. 21. In this last passage the relation of Christ to our sins is said to be by an act of God. And the same is implied in Rom. iii. 25: for propitiation implies sin. Consequently, the death of Christ is our ransom: Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5, 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23. He is our slain passover, 1 Cor. v. 7: for the Paschal lamb by its own death saved the firstborn from death. This explains the otherwise inexplicable teaching of 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 25 that we are sharers in the blood of Christ, and that the New Covenant is ratified in His blood, passages which teach plainly that we receive benefit, even the benefits of the New Covenant, from Christ's death.

That our life comes through Christ's death, is the only explana-

tion of the remarkable phrases *crucified with Christ, crucified the flesh, the world crucified*, in Gal. ii. 20, v. 24, vi. 14; and of the argument in Rom. vi. 4—8. For, if our deliverance from sin comes through the death by which Christ Himself escaped from the curse of our sin, then are we crucified with Christ: for we share the results of His crucifixion. The same is implied in 2 Cor. v. 15 which teaches that Christ died in order that our old life may cease and that we may live a life altogether new. Similarly Rom. xiv. 9, 'to this end Christ died . . . that both of dead and living He might become Lord.' All this is confirmed by the teaching in Rom. vii. 4 that we died to the Law by the slain body of Christ in order that we may bear fruit for God; and by the teaching in Gal. iii. 13f that Christ bore our curse that we might receive the Holy Spirit. The infinite importance of the death of Christ receives remarkable illustration in Gal. vi. 14, where we read that, by the cross of Christ, Paul himself has died, and that therefore in that cross he glories and in nothing else.

The above teaching in these four Epistles is supported by abundant similar teaching in the other Epistles bearing the name of Paul; and by very conspicuous teaching in the Epistle to the Hebrews: e.g. Eph. ii. 13, 16, Ph. iii. 18, Col. i. 20, 22, ii. 14, 20, 1 Tim. ii. 6, 2 Tim. ii. 12, Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ii. 9, 14, vii. 27, ix. 12—28, x. 12—14, 29, xiii. 12.

3. The passages quoted above prove indisputably that Paul believed so firmly that our life comes through Christ's death, and attached to this doctrine so great importance, that it moulded his entire thought. Now even if his teaching on this subject stood alone, it would, as a very remarkable theological fact, demand explanation. We should ask whence it was derived. But it does not stand alone. Similar teaching is equally conspicuous in the Gospel and First Epistle of John: Jno. i. 29, iii. 14, x. 15, 17f, xi. 50ff, xii. 24, xv. 13; 1 Jno. ii. 2, iii. 16, iv. 10. And it is the only explanation of the strange teaching in Jno. vi. 51—56 that in order to obtain eternal life we must eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God. That our life comes through Christ's death, is taught by Christ in each of the other Gospels: Mt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28; Mk. x. 45, xiv. 24, Lk. xxii. 20, xxiv. 46f; and very clearly in 1 Pet. i. 18f, ii. 21—24, iii. 18, iv. 13; and in Rev. i. 5, v. 6, 9, vii. 14. We notice, however, that, like Justification by Faith, the doctrine that our life comes through Christ's death is absent from the Epistle of James.

Of this unanimity of nearly all the early disciples of Christ whose writings have come down to us, the only conceivable explanation is that the doctrine so confidently believed by the disciples was actually taught by their Master. For only thus can this unanimity be accounted for. To deny this, is, apart from all special authority of Holy Scripture, to trample under foot all the laws of historical research.

We are now face to face with the fact that Christ taught that His own death, not merely was an appropriate end of a life devoted to the interests of mankind, but is the channel through which comes the salvation He proclaimed; or, in other words, that the death of Christ holds a unique place even in His spotless life as being, in a sense shared by nothing else He did, the means of man's salvation. As an indisputable historical fact, this result would remain even if we were utterly unable to explain the connection between our salvation and the death of Christ. To determine this connection, is, however, an all-important aim for further and reverent research.

4. An aid in our inquiry is found in Rom. iii. 26, where we learn that, apart from the propitiatory death of Christ, it would be inconsistent with the justice of God to justify men. Than these, no words could more strongly announce the absolute necessity of Christ's death for our salvation. For God cannot be unjust. Now we can well understand that the justice of God would not permit justification of the guilty by mere prerogative. For, what God forbad in earthly judges (Dt. xxv. 1, Isa. v. 23) He could not Himself do. Indeed, it is a universal principle of human government that to permit the guilty to escape is to overturn all morality and the very foundations of society. And we may well suppose that this universal principle, like all such, has a root deeper than human society, that it rests upon the essential relations of intelligent creatures. If so, having its root in the Creator Himself, this principle will regulate His action. We may therefore conceive that God's love to men forbad Him, as a king's intelligent wish for the welfare of his people always forbids, to pardon sin by simple prerogative. For, such pardon would teach that the Law of God might be set aside. We may therefore believe that in order, without overturning His own Law which is an outflow of His goodness, to save those whom the Law condemned God sent His own Son so to unite Himself to us in human flesh that the penalty due to us should fall upon Him, who alone could endure that penalty without absolute destruc-

tion, in order that thus the Law might have its full course and the essential connection between sin and death be maintained, and yet the condemned race might, by contact with Incarnate Life, survive the infliction of the penalty and in spite of it attain eternal life.

This solution, imperfect and tentative as it is, would account for all the Bible says about the death of Christ. For, if God sent His Son to save men from dying by Himself dying, then was Christ given by God to die in our stead; and, consequently, His blood is our ransom price. Since He saves us from the anger of God against sin, 'He is a propitiation for our sins.' Since by His death Christ escaped from the curse of our sins and thus saved us from that curse, we are sharers with Christ in the results of His own death and may therefore be said to be crucified with Him. And, since by union with Him in His death we are delivered from bondage to our own flesh and to the world, that henceforth we may live a new life of which He is the one aim, to us the world and the flesh are crucified by His cross and our old life has been buried in His grave.

5. Notice carefully that the coming of Christ is ever traced to the love of God. Whatever the Son did, He did at the Father's bidding. Consequently, His death reveals the Father's infinite love to our race: Rom. v. 8, viii. 32, Jno. iii. 16, x. 18. To represent the Father as implacable, and the Son as pleading for those whom the Father was minded to slay, is to deny, by a hideous caricature, the unity of Father and Son and the Father's infinite love to fallen man, and to contradict the teaching of the entire New Testament.

6. In Gal. ii. 21 Paul says that if righteousness come by law, then has Christ died in vain, i.e. without motive and without result. This assertion, the above exposition explains and justifies. For righteousness by law is God's approval obtained by obedience. If this were possible, the Law would need no vindication. For, justification of those who have kept the Law, is simply a carrying out of the principles of law. There would therefore be no need for the death of Christ. And we observe that they who teach that morality is the one and sufficient cure for human ailments have no need and no place in their teaching for the cross of Christ.

In a sense still more serious Paul's words are true. If the favour of God which comes through Christ's death were conditional on man's previous obedience, i.e. if righteousness came

by law, we could never obtain it: for none can keep the Law as it claims to be kept, none can present a perfect morality. Consequently, if righteousness were by law, righteousness would be to us impossible. And the merciful purpose of the death of Christ would be thwarted. In spite of it all men would perish.

All this reveals the essential connection between Justification by Faith and Justification through the Death of Christ. To surrender the one, is practically to surrender the other. And each doctrine supports the other. The very blood of Christ proclaims that there is salvation even for those who find themselves unable to keep the Law. Justification by faith, which seems at first to violate the principles of law, needs to be itself justified by some tremendous vindication of the inviolability of the Law. This vindication is found in the death of Him who though sinless joined Himself to sinful flesh and blood. The costliness of the vindication proves the sacredness of the principles vindicated, of the eternal principles of morality embodied in the Law of God.

7. In the closely related matter of Justification, we have already seen that Christian opinion has varied greatly. Fortunately in reference to the death of Christ there has been, as apparently in the Churches of Galatia in Paul's day, so in the Church of Christ throughout all ages and all countries, a practical unanimity. In the presence of this tremendous sacrifice even theological disputation has been hushed into silence and agreement. During long centuries the eyes of all His followers have been fixed upon His cross as the unique manifestation of the infinite love of God, and as the one channel through which that love has reached and saved them. From that Cross the most illustrious of the Servants of Christ have drawn the inspiration which made them great; and moved by the love there manifested thousands have died for Him who first died for them.

DISSERTATION VIII.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

1. Our chief gains from the Epistle to the Galatians are theological and historical.

2. We have in this Epistle another independent view of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, in addition to that presented

in the Epistle to the Romans. This second view, like a view of a great building from another standpoint, gives to our conception of the doctrine a sense of reality and of spiritual perspective not felt before. And this is increased by the entire difference of the points of view. In the Epistle to the Romans we found Justification by Faith the massive foundation-stone of a compact theological structure: and we viewed it in relation to the other parts of the same building. We here see it standing alone, a lofty monument in solitary grandeur: we look at it from all sides, and observe its unique position even amid the other doctrines of the Gospel. Moreover, we see it, not as in Romans calmly expounded in quiet theological thought, but in living combat with actual and deadly error. The intense earnestness of Paul's argument and appeal reveals the immense practical importance of the doctrine, and the greatness of the issues therein involved.

This earnestness reveals also the infinite importance of Christian doctrine in general, in wide contrast to the comparative indifference to doctrine boasted of now by many moral teachers. Such indifference was utterly alien to the heart of Paul. That which filled him with perplexity (ch. iv. 20) about his readers and with fear (*v.* 11, ii. 2) lest his labours be in vain and Christ profit (v. 2) them nothing, was purely doctrinal error. In the main argument of the Epistle morality is not even mentioned. Paul's anxiety about the Galatian Christians is indisputable and conspicuous proof of his firm belief that the spiritual and moral power of the Gospel rests on its doctrinal teaching.

The expositions of the Old Testament are not only welcome additions to those in the Epistle to the Romans but frequently cast upon these last individually additional light, thus enabling us better to understand Paul's conception of the significance of the story of the Old Covenant. And the quotation and exposition, in each Epistle, of Gen. xv. 6, Hab. ii. 4, Lev. xix. 18 do great service by fixing attention on three passages which made so deep a mark in the mind of Paul and of other early Christian teachers. They will well repay, as will the other quotations in this Epistle, most careful study.

In many details the Epistle to the Galatians completes the theological teaching of the other three Epistles. We rise from it with a fuller and more accurate comprehension of the Gospel as Paul understood it, and of its fitness to supply our spiritual need.

3. Not less valuable are our historical gains.

This Epistle confirms the genuineness of those to the Romans and Corinthians. For, while its almost unmitigated censure is very unlike the work of a forger and the earnestness and sadness of the whole breathes intense reality, it is indisputably from the author of the other Epistles. Its marks of genuineness are therefore additional proofs that they are genuine.

Important light is here cast on the early history of Paul. In this, as we have seen in Diss. i., the Epistle partly confirms and partly supplements the narrative of the Book of Acts.

Scarcely less valuable is the light cast on the position and character of Peter. We find him occupying, in close accord with the position given him by Christ in the Gospels, a unique position as the Apostle of the circumcision. And we see him betraying, under insignificant personal influence which yet he was unable to resist, the truth he had shortly before so loyally defended, in strange harmony with his denial of Christ for whom he had the same night been ready to fight and to die. This remarkable agreement confirms both the genuineness of this Epistle and the correctness of the delineations of Peter in the four Gospels.

The position held in ch. ii. 9 by James as the first mentioned of the three pillars, and his welcome to Paul, agree closely with the notices of him, scanty though they are, in the Book of Acts, and with the Epistle attributed to him. We are glad to have a momentary sight of the Apostle John. And the references to Titus and Barnabas are welcome additions in close harmony with our other notices of them.

We thus gain from this Epistle a much fuller personal acquaintance with the most prominent men of the Apostolic Church: and this gives us a more definite and accurate conception of the founding of the Church.

Still more important is the light cast by this Epistle on the most serious crisis through which the Church ever passed, viz. the transition of Christianity from being a form of Judaism to becoming a world-wide religion. We not only, as in Acts xv. 1—29, witness the struggle but we feel its intensity vibrating in every line of this Epistle.

This authentic picture of an early struggle on which hung the fate of Christianity and of the world has abiding and infinite value. For, this ancient conflict has its root in deep underlying principles of human nature. The relation of Judaism to Pauline Christianity, of works to faith, involves the great question, dis-

cussed in all ages, of the relation of morality and outward forms of religion to the inward and supernatural power promised and given by Christ. To determine this relation is one chief task of the theologian and the preacher. And in this task the Epistle before us renders invaluable aid.

The abiding conflict just referred to assumed special prominence at the Reformation. The teaching current in the Church of Rome then, and to some extent even now, I am compelled to believe, presents points of similarity, amid essential differences, to that of the Judaizers in Galatia. Indeed, of the various corruptions of Christianity, very many are returns towards Judaism. That the teaching for which Luther fought so strenuously was in the main the doctrine defended with equal earnestness in the Epistle before us by the Great Apostle of the Gentiles, is suggested by the Reformer's great love for this Epistle, and seems to me proved by his exposition of it which still remains to us. Considering then its evident influence on the mind of Luther, it is not too much to say that to the Epistle we have in this volume studied we owe in no small degree the great outburst of spiritual life which marked the early part of the sixteenth century. From the silent pages of this letter sprang forth the spirit of Paul to plead once more for the truths he so faithfully defended in the infancy of the Church. And to that revival of the spirit of Paul is due, by the grace of God, the spiritual life of the Protestant nations of the present day.

The immediate effect of this letter is quite unknown to us. Indeed we have only one later glimpse, for a moment, of the Apostolic Churches of Galatia. The mission (2 Tim. iv. 10) of Crescens 'to Galatia' may have been to the European home of the Gauls, not necessarily to their Asiatic settlement. But the mention of Galatia in 1 Pet. i. 1 implies that, when Peter wrote, the Churches planted by Paul still existed and were looked upon as part of the Christian community.

Various casual notices by Eusebius, Jerome, and other later writers shed some light upon the Galatian Christians in the third and fourth centuries. And these references reveal dissensions as serious as, though quite different from, those which occasioned the letter before us. The permanence of the Churches in Galatia, and their discord, suggest perhaps that this letter was in its immediate purpose successful; but that the fickle disposition of the people remained unchanged, and that the children of

those who in Paul's day were so easily led astray by false teachers of Jewish nationality were in later days ready to accept any new heresy which arose. Thus the subsequent history of the Galatian Churches adds solemnity to the warnings of the Epistle we now reluctantly close.

THE END.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS

ON THE AUTHOR'S

COMMENTARIES ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

From ARCHDEACON FARRAR *in* THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

"We are sure that readers will be struck by the strength and sobriety of his conclusions. Rejecting all parade of learning, all multiplication of authorities, and all discussion of varying opinions, he gives his conclusions as the direct result of close reasoning and examination. Any one who will consult his notes on disputed passages, such as Gal. iii. 16 or Gal. iii. 20, or the one passage in which St. Paul borrows a passing illustration from the Philonian method of allegory (Gal. iv. 21—31), will appreciate the value of the method which gives them the final inferences of sound thought, while it spares them the interminable fancies of exegetic superficiality. We heartily thank Mr. Beet for his work."

From C. H. SPURGEON, *in* THE SWORD AND TROWEL.

"An exposition of the utmost value."

From THE CLERGYMAN'S MAGAZINE.

"It will be a mine of wealth to either clergy or teachers who have to prepare sermons or other work from this epistle. Had we to make choice of one commentary only on the Galatians, we should be quite content to be shut up with this."

From JOHN BULL.

"Of Mr. Beet's far more important work on the Epistle to the Galatians it would be difficult to speak too highly. This volume completes his exposition of the group of Epistles which includes that to the Romans and those to the Corinthians. As a specimen of the well-balanced judgment which Mr. Beet brings to bear on a knotty point of textual criticism we may mention his treatment of the disputed reading in Gal. iv. 25; while

for lucidity and spirituality of exegesis we should select his note on Gal. vi. 14 as an excellent example. The Dissertations, especially the excellent one on 'The Cross of Christ,' deserve special commendation."

From THE SATURDAY REVIEW.

"It reveals throughout patient and conscientious labour, and is well worthy the attention of students."

From THE SCOTSMAN.

"Of the conscientious study and accurate scholarship displayed in this volume, it is impossible to speak with too high praise."

From THE DUBLIN REVIEW, *Roman Catholic Quarterly.*

"This learned work deserves special notice, for it combines two peculiarities not often found together. It is a thoroughly English Commentary, and yet one that speaks both fairly and kindly of the Catholic Church. We are so accustomed to translations from the German that it is quite refreshing to notice the work of a genuine English scholar, and to find that, without being inferior in learning, it surpasses foreign works in clearness and method. In fact, the Rev. Mr. Beet is to be congratulated on his success as an expositor, understanding as he does exactly what a reader wants in a Commentary—much knowledge and copious reading condensed into small compass. The analysis of each chapter is most carefully done, and the sequence of thought clearly shown. Another special feature of Mr. Beet's method is the stress he lays on the Evidences of Christianity and the undesigned coincidences which overthrow the objections of modern scepticism. Mr. Beet's theological views on certain points are in contradiction to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and for that very reason we appreciate the more his kindly tone and his scrupulous fairness. . . . Nor does Mr. Beet allow any odium theologicum to hinder him from doing justice to his opponent's case. When discussing the Catholic teaching of the Real Presence, he is careful to use the Church's own language as found in the Council of Trent. . . . We have then to thank the Rev. Mr. Beet for his excellent Commentary, and to express the hope that he may be able to accomplish his intention of explaining the other Epistles of the Great Apostle."

LONDON: HODDER AND STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

HODDER & STOUGHTON'S

New and Recent Publications.

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE.

EDITED BY

THE REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., Editor of *The Expositor.*

This Series consists of EXPOSITORY LECTURES on all the Books of the BIBLE by the foremost Preachers and Theologians of the day. While regarding the latest results of Scholarship, the Volumes are essentially popular, and adapted to general readers quite as much as to the clergy. SIX Volumes will be published a year.

Crown 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d. each Volume.

And it is expected that the volumes published during 1888-9 will be as under :—

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. *BY THE REV. PROFESSOR G. G. FINDLAY, B.A.*, Headingly College, Leeds.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH. Vol. I. *BY THE REV. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, M.A.*, Aberdeen.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN. *BY THE RIGHT REV. W. ALEXANDER, D.D., D.C.L.*, Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. *BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.*, Master of University College, Durham.

THE BOOKS OF JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS. *BY THE REV. C. J. BALL, M.A.*, Chaplain at Lincoln's Inn.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. *BY THE REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.*

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE.

FIRST YEAR'S ISSUE.

Crown 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d. each Volume.

I.

ST. MARK. *BY THE REV. A. CHADWICK D.D.*, Dean of Armagh.

"Dr. Chadwick's style is characteristic, thoughtful, clear, and vigorous. He is never commonplace or trivial."—*Record.*

"A valuable, interesting, and delightful work, almost every page of which contains something worthy of quotation."—*English Churchman.*

II.

COLOSSIANS AND PHILEMON. *BY THE REV. ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D.*

"Contains a wealth of thought for preachers. The scene, the circumstances, and feelings of St. Paul are pictured with a graphic pen."—*Rock.*

"Dr. Maclaren is careful and scholarly in his exposition of the meaning of Scripture, as well as an eloquent preacher of its truths. His eloquence is not the eloquence of words only, but of thought."—*Nonconformist.*

III.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. *BY MARCUS DODS, D.D.*

"Dr. Dods has a steady head, a practised hand, and a determined will. With admirable address he has steered his way between the shoals and rocks of preliminary questions, and has brought safely to port his rich cargo of exposition, the product of many an arduous voyage of discovery and research."—Rev. Prof. W. G. ELMSLIE.

"Of the utmost value to preachers and teachers, being very full of suggestive thoughts."—*English Churchman.*

IV.

THE FIRST BOOK OF SAMUEL. *BY THE REV. PROFESSOR W. G. BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D.*

V.

THE SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL. *BY THE SAME AUTHOR.*

"Dr. Blaikie's volumes on 1 and 2 Samuel are scholarly, and written in a popular style. Nowhere have we met with so thoroughly satisfactory a treatment of the lives of Samuel and Saul."—*Baptist Magazine.*

VI.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. *BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL T. C. EDWARDS, D.D.*, Author of "A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians."

"To those who are acquainted with Dr. Edwards' 'Commentary on First Corinthians,' it need scarcely be said that in the present volume there is abundant evidence of accurate scholarship, acute criticism, patient thought, and faculty of lucid exposition. It is a painstaking, substantial, worthy exposition."—*British Weekly.*

Third and Cheaper Edition (Unabridged), 7s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF

WILLIAM MORLEY PUNSHON, LL.D.

BY THE REV. F. W. MACDONALD.

With etched portrait by Manesse.

PRESS NOTICES.

"The story is one of high example. If ever there was an instance of a life worn out in the indefatigable fulfilment of the highest of all duties, it is that which is recorded with much ability, as well as good taste and feeling, in this book."—*Daily News.*

"Mr. Macdonald has special qualifications to write the life of the most brilliant and charming rhetorician God ever gave to Methodism. His own extraordinary gift of copious and beautiful language enables him to produce an appropriate record of Dr. Punshon's great oratorical career. This volume abounds with felicities and subtleties of style. At the same time it is a marked by a fidelity of judgment and criticism rare in friendly biography."—*Methodist Times.*

"The penalties of popularity have seldom been more vividly displayed than in the thoughtful and picturesque biography which Mr. Macdonald has written with a skilful and sympathetic pen. Apart from its literary merit, which is very considerable, the principal charm of the book consists in frank, artless, and often pathetic extracts from Dr. Punshon's letters and journals, which afford the reader unexpected and deeply interesting glimpses of the great preacher's inner life."—*Leeds Mercury.*

"It is in every way worthy both of its subject and of its author. That Mr. Macdonald would write in chaste and beautiful English, illuminating his story with graceful allusions and fine analysis, and discovering the spring among the mountains where rose the stream which blessed even more than it charmed, we were quite prepared to find. But we were scarcely prepared for the biographic art so fully developed as it unquestionably is in this volume."—*Methodist Recorder.*

"We find the life of Dr. Punshon deeply interesting, and the work of the biographer is undoubtedly marked by much skill, by excellent taste, and by admirable discretion. Here and there, too, a shrewd humour twinkles between the lines. Once more we express our high appreciation of the man described, our deep interest in the life recorded, and our grateful admiration of the workmanship displayed in this life."—*Record.*

"His life, as told by Mr. Macdonald in a singularly felicitous manner, is full of interest and instruction."—*Nonconformist.*

NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.

BY

PROFESSOR HENRY DRUMMOND, F.R.S.E., F.G.S.,

Twenty-third Edition, completing Eighty-second Thousand. In Crown 8vo, price 3s. 6d.

"We have no hesitation in saying that this is one of the most able and interesting books on the relations which exist between natural science and spiritual life that has appeared. Mr. Drummond writes perfect English; his ideas are fresh, and expressed with admirable felicity."—*Literary Churchman.*

"This is one of the most impressive and suggestive books on religion that we have read for a long time. Indeed, with the exception of Dr. Mozley's 'University Sermons,' we can recall no book of our time which showed such a power of restating the moral and practical truths of religion so as to make them take fresh hold of the mind and vividly impress the imagination."—*Spectator.*

"A remarkable book, full of deep and original, though sometimes fantastic, thoughts. The great popularity which it has attained is due in a very large measure to the fact that it professes to supply what is, just for the moment, a very real want."—*Guardian.*

"A most remarkable volume. It is perfectly delightful to turn to the calm, judicial, scholarly, and pre-eminently tolerant work of Professor Drummond."—*Knowledge.*

THE LIFE OF JOHN WESLEY.

BY

THE REV. JOHN TELFORD, Author of "Wesley's Anecdotes," etc.

With a Facsimile Letter of John Wesley's as a Frontispiece.

In crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

"Mr. John Telford has written a 'Life of John Wesley' which will probably enjoy a lasting sale. It is comparatively brief, and yet sufficient, for it is worked out with much studious care and literary skill, and, though after so many reapers, the author has been able to make a few gleanings even of new facts. On disputed points he has been discreet, and while not concealing his own views, has avoided giving offence."—*Contemporary Review.*

"It not only portrays Wesley 'in his habit as he lived,' but pictures the struggles of Methodism in his days, affords many curious and instructive glimpses of national manners, and furnishes altogether a concise and interesting sketch of a great episode in our religious history."—*Daily News.*

"Mr. Telford has met one of the most urgent biographical needs of the day, and by the style and spirit in which he has done his work, has achieved a very conspicuous success. He has given to the world, and not merely to his own community, a life of Wesley which everybody will read, from which a just and eminently suggestive conception of the great historical figure may be formed, and to which the coming historian of Methodism, anxious to obtain carefully verified details of out-of-the-way facts, may turn with no little advantage."—*London Quarterly Review.*

Eighth Thousand. With Six Maps and Illustrations, price 6s.

TROPICAL AFRICA.

BY HENRY DRUMMOND, F.R.S.E., F.G.S., Author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," etc.

"Professor Drummond is a clear and accurate observer, and as he has had a sound scientific training, and has a real interest in the human side of African life, he is able to present us with pictures of a distinctness and originality not often met with in books of African travel."—*Times.*

"We are likely before long to hear a good deal about the Shiré Highlands of 'Central East Aaia,' and a better means for acquainting the public with an outline of the situation than Professor Drummond's volume can hardly be imagined."—*Murray's Magazine.*

"It is a charmingly written book. . . . Professor Drummond has not inflicted the entire contents of his notebooks upon a long-suffering public; he has been content, with valuable and suggestive results, to compress the sum of his observations into a few well-weighed and well-written pages."—*Saturday Review.*

"Professor Drummond is here at his very best. The article on mimicry especially is worthy to rank with anything ever written by Wallace, Bates, or Darwin himself on this fascinating subject. In the presence of such perfect form, such graphic description of details, such genial humour and subtle reasoning, the critic has nothing to do but quote. The only difficulty is to find one passage more suitable than another for the purpose."—*Academy.*

"Professor Henry Drummond, F.G.S., thinks that heavy books of travel have had their day, and so he gives us in 'Tropical Africa,' a single volume, 'dealing with the larger features of the country, lightly sketched, and just enough of narrative to make you feel that you are really there. Throughout, brevity has been aimed at, but the style is so genial, and the facts for the most part so novel, one could well have pardoned Professor Drummond had he been more voluminous."—*Daily Telegraph.*

"The only fault which most readers will find with the present volume is its brevity. Professor Drummond is a keen observer of natural history; he is not without humour and pathos; and he possesses the power of presenting graphic sketches of scenery or character in simple language. There is nothing heavy or redundant in his book. It is lively and interesting from the first page to the last; and though students of African travel may ask for fuller details, the non-specialist public will probably gain a clearer idea of Central Africa from Professor Drummond than from any other writer. His chapter on the termites, or so-called white ants, is probably the most graphic extant, and his theory that these insects perform for Africa the work done by earthworms in temperate climes is original and likely to stand."—*Scotsman.*

In crown 8vo, price 9s., with Map and Illustrations.

MODERN SCIENCE IN BIBLE LANDS.

BY SIR WILLIAM DAWSON, F.R.S.

This work is intended as a supplement to the Author's previous volumes entitled "The Story of the Earth," "The Origin of the World," and "Fossil Men," and more especially to bring out the new information obtained in his recent travels in the East, and his matured conclusions respecting certain debated points not treated of, or only slightly noticed, in the works named above.

"It would take a long essay to do justice to the many topics handled in Sir William Dawson's profoundly interesting work."—*St. James's Gazette.*

"There is good stuff in the book; the style is lucid and pleasant, and readers who have sufficient knowledge to discriminate while they read, will not come empty away."—*Manchester Examiner.*

"The results of a tour through Italy, Egypt, and Syria, collected by a geological observer of such eminence as Sir William Dawson has shown himself to be, cannot but be of great value. Such are his knowledge and grasp of the subject, his perfect fairness and impartiality, and his close and careful reasoning, that it is not too much to say that he has summed the present extent of our knowledge of Bible lands."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

I.

THE ORIGIN OF THE WORLD,

According to Revelation and Science.

Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

"We heartily commend the book to all those who are interested in this most important question. Dr. Dawson is a man well-known in the ranks of science for great breadth and grasp of knowledge; he has been a pioneer in geological discovery; he is also a considerable Hebrew scholar, well read in the Bible, and especially those parts which treat of nature. . . . It is a valuable addition to Bible criticism from a point of view higher scientifically than we have yet had."—*Spectator.*

II.

FOSSIL MEN AND THEIR MODERN REPRESENTATIVES.

An attempt to illustrate the Characters and Condition of Pre-Historic Men in Europe by those of the American Races.

With Forty-four Illustrations. Third Thousand. Crown 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

III.

THE STORY OF THE EARTH AND MAN.

With Twenty Illustrations. Third Thousand. Crown 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

"This is a book of rare excellence. Dr. Dawson has been for twenty years a geologist of high repute, and has gained a world-wide fame in connection with the discovery of the celebrated Eozoon Canadense, the earliest known fossil. We turn to his book with high interest and keen anticipation. And we are not disappointed; for we find an account of the geological history and the past life of the earth—full yet concise, accurate yet pictorial, and almost poetic. And we most heartily commend to our readers a book so full of interest, so radiant with truth."—*British Quarterly Review.*